THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

OL. LII. No. 343 JANUARY, 1949

KOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Weg on Bobbie . . . . . *W. G. C. Addison*

Germany Revisited . . . . . *F. L. Cross*

Theology and Agriculture

Arthur Cayley Headlam and the Fourth Gospel . . . . . *R. V. G. Tasker*

Romans vii. 18 *f.* . . . . . *Wilfrid Browning*

For full list of contents see within.

KOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Edited by Alec R. Vidler at Windsor Castle, and published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

. per copy. 12s. per annum, post free.

the U.S.A, $3.60 payable to the Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue, New York 11 N.Y.

V.52
1949 40151

THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, D.D., 8, The Cloisters, Windsor Castle, Berks. (MSS should not exceed 3,500 words, and should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.)

Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2.

Advisory Committee

Montgomery Belgion
The Rev. Frank Bennett
The Rev. L. J. Collins
The Rev. W. W. S. March
The Rev. Prof. E. C. Ratcliff
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.

Editorial Representative in the U.S.A.: The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York City

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Weg on Bobbie	*W. G. C. Addison*	1
Germany Revisited	*F. L. Cross*	8
Theology and Agriculture		16
Arthur Cayley Headlam and the Fourth Gospel	*R. V. G. Tasker*	17
Studies in Texts: Romans vii. 18*f.*	*Wilfrid Browning*	22
Correspondence:		
The Ministry	*T. S. Garrett and Eric Kemp*	26
The Burial Service	*Austin Lee*	30
Book Reviews:		
W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*	*Wilfred L. Knox*	31
D. G. M. Patrick, *Pascal and Kierkegaard*	*J. C. Mears*	34
G. O. Griffith, *The Theology of P. T. Forsyth*	*Theodore O. Wedel*	36
A. W. Hopkinson, *About William Law*	*George Seaver*	37
Ashley Sampson (Ed.), *The Englishman's Religion*	*Frank Bennett*	38
Shorter Notices		39
Books Received		40

THEOLOGY

VOL. LII JANUARY, 1949 No. 343

Note

THE Editor's address is now: 8, The Cloisters, Windsor Castle, Berks.

Weg on Bobbie

IN other words, W. E. Gladstone on *Robert Elsmere*—a work which it may be presumed few Englishmen now alive have read or even skimmed. Mrs Humphry Ward, some of whose novels are as readable as Trollope's, has not shared in the return of the Victorian novelists to public favour. But when *Robert Elsmere* first appeared, "everybody" read it, and the late starters on new fiction certainly made haste to do so when Mr Gladstone wrote on "*Robert Elsmere* and the Battle for Belief" in the *Nineteenth Century* for May, 1888. Statesmen stayed up half the night to finish it, divines and dons worked it into their sermons, lectures, books. Editions, three-volume and popular, were bought at the rate of thousands a month. In America the public excitement was even more intense—and there was no copyright. *Elsmere* sold in tens of thousands at nominal prices; nay, a free copy was presented gratis to every purchaser of one cake of Balsam's Fir Soap. And there were other transatlantic phenomena—*e.g.*, a dramatized version with a comedy element. Our title, however, is of Cockney vintage; it was a London lady struggling into a bus clutching a copy of the *Nineteenth Century* who was overheard by one of Mrs Ward's family exclaiming to her friend, "Oh, my dear, have you read Weg on Bobbie?" Her name remains unknown and unremembered; her apt epitome of a theological skirmish deserves immortality. "Weg on Bobbie": a prize of a thousand guineas would not elicit a more accurate and concentrated index to whole centuries of metaphysical and ecclesiastical controversy. Seldom in the annals of human thought have so few words said so much. Within the compass of those four monosyllables lie not only the more immediate incidents in the later Victorian, post-Darwinian, post-Hegelian battle for belief, but also, range behind range, back to the Fathers of the Church and the sages of ancient Greece, the successive phases and syntheses of the arguments for a theistic and a Christian faith. To construe "Weg on Bobbie" is to find the key to whole libraries of now unreadable apologetics and, we dare venture to add, to the present conflict of fundamental ideologies within every non-Roman Christian communion. To say "Weg on Bobbie" is to uncover such perennial issues as Natural and Revealed Theology, Theism and dogmatic Protestantism, Imman-

ence and Transcendence, Catholicism and Liberalism, and various lesser alternatives of emphasis in the human and historical disentanglement of Appearance and Reality. On a lower or at least more concrete level, *Robert Elsmere* is a most significant document in the history of the awakening of the social conscience in the breasts of those elect Victorian intellectuals who, stimulated by T. H. Green, had begun to question the *laissez faire* individualism of J. S. Mill. This facet of the novel and its fortunes is, for instance, the one given most emphasis by R. H. Gretton in his chronicle of the later Victorian decades. "The appearance of the book remains a monument of that searching of the social conscience which had so strikingly come to light every now and then in the early eighties and in 1888 was the predominant influence" (*Modern History of the English People*, I, 227).

But it was the theological not the social interest of the novel which attracted Mr Gladstone. His review in the *Nineteenth Century* may perhaps be set alongside Jowett on The Interpretation of Scripture (1860) or Bradley on The Presuppositions of Critical History (1874) or Gore on Inspiration (1889) as marking in a few pages of print not merely a passing interest but a permanent transformation of the educated Englishman's attitude of mind and outlook. For though neither Mr Gladstone nor Mrs Ward were in these regions powerful and creative thinkers, they were both entitled to pose, as history has posed them, as protagonists in this particular incident in the never-ending debate. They were courteous and conciliatory in its conduct because they were both utterly sincere and deeply stirred; they were arguing for the truth and not for victory. That counts for more than is sometimes recognized. Nor were they so ill-matched as might appear. Both were amateurs—but the issues were so wide that not even an Aristotle, an Abelard, or a Leonardo da Vinci, would have been adequately equipped at all points. Yet both were much more than amateurs if the word implies spasmodic and easy-going dilettantism. As for Mr Gladstone, now seventy-eight years old, it is needless to dilate on his lifelong dedication of a first-class mind to the study of the evidence of a divine revelation and to the origins of Christianity. A German handbook of early Church History went with him on his honeymoon, and the decades that had followed had been as full of theological and historical study as of political activity. He knew every learned man of his age and country; his favourite companions were Acton and Döllinger. He was a one-time President of the Metaphysical Society, and if he was not a scientist he was not unfamiliar with the scientific approach to the ultimate questions. It is, as Chesterton was so fond of saying, scarcely a tenable proposition that the President of the Metaphysical Society was ignorant of the tone and temper of the contemporary discussions of the British Association. But those who know their Morley and the few who still peruse Mr Gladstone's printed remains will need no convincing that "Weg" brought a powerful mind and a practised pen to his critical study of "Bobbie," nor that engaged on such a theme Mr Gladstone's customary intensity and diligence were

redoubled. But what of Mrs Ward—had she the heavy guns necessary to a fair exchange of argument? The answer is an emphatic affirmative. As Gladstone, had he fulfilled his earliest intention to take Orders, might have passed into history as a great Christian philosopher or ecclesiastical statesman, so Mrs Humphrey Ward, had not marriage and literature and public philanthropy governed her course, would undoubtedly have entered upon a distinguished career in scholarship or peradventure in educational administration.

As novelist, Mrs Ward is commonly classed with George Eliot, in that for both the novel was utilized as a vehicle of ideas and to dramatize and personalize moral and spiritual conflict, personal or public. The comparison holds, too, in respect of the hard intellectual edge of their minds; both of them, indeed, were learned enough to stand before professors without fear. Married at twenty to a Fellow of Brasenose and a *Times* leader-writer, Mrs Ward was soon at home among the leaders of the renascence in history and theology of that happy time at Oxford; Jowett and Pattison drew her out; Freeman and J. R. Green set her to projects of research and composition, until she was found interrupting Stubbs himself in her employ of rare authorities on Visigothic Spain; Creighton was her confidant; above all T. H. Green she learned to love and revere for his intellectual integrity and nobility of spirit. Good seed had fallen into good ground, and the first early harvest—some articles in Dean Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*—was a promise of greater things to come. The cares of a household and a removal to London estopped a career that otherwise would certainly have led to distinction and eminence in ecclesiastical or historical scholarship. Almost to the end of her life Mrs Ward would snatch a daily half-hour before breakfast for Homer or St John or St Paul in the original tongue—one indication that even the craft of the novelist and the care of London's cripple children had not submerged the scholar's mind in Matthew Arnold's niece and Dr Arnold's granddaughter. London, too, whither Mr and Mrs Ward migrated in 1881, provided further opportunities for mental growth; there were studies and reviews in *Macmillan's Magazine* on a wide variety of literary and theological topics; there was the translation of Amiel's *Journal*, which in itself was no bad preparation for a novel of interior religious conflict. Thus, when at thirty-seven years of age Mrs Ward encountered Mr Gladstone, and they began their verbal discussion of the evidences of Christianity she, as much as he, had earned, by industry and reflection, through books and contacts with learned men, the right to maintain her cause even in the face of his "white and stern and angry brows."

The battle for belief was joined in Edward Talbot's drawing-room at Keble College, where Mr Gladstone was staying with the warden. Mrs Ward was in Oxford following her mother's death, which occurred six weeks after "Bobbie's" appearance. They met on two successive days in early April, 1888; thereafter they exchanged sundry letters, and Mr Gladstone forwarded a marked copy of his

Gleanings (Vol. III), in which had been reprinted an article from the *Contemporary Review* for June, 1876, on "The Courses of Religious Thought." We may assume Mrs Ward had already seen the preceding reprint—a review of Seeley's *Ecce Homo* (1868). By May the *Nineteenth Century* was to hand, and the dossier of this particular "incident" was completed with the publication of Mrs J. P. Trevelyan's *Life* of her mother in 1923. We may select two themes which recur and intermingle both in the epistolary exchanges and in the articles: the reality of moral evil, of a "Fall," of the inherent degeneracy of man, and secondly, the nature and office of a church.

(*a*) As Mrs Ward noted down after their first talk, to Mr Gladstone, "the great fact in the world and in the history of man is *sin*." By that criterion, she added, he judges and condemns the anti-theism of the neo-pagans, the agnostics and the positivists, and also the refined theism of Martineau, Green, and Jevons. For herself, the great fact in human history is *progress*, not mechanical and economic, but moral and spiritual; the modern layman (whose religious sense is as alert as that of the dogmatist) accepts, of course, the presence of moral imperfection in himself and in the race, but he is not bowed down by that awful sense of brooding evil which has produced the doctrines and rituals of propitiation and purification; the modern man trusts the Omnipotent Goodness (which Christ came to reveal), strives to overcome his faults, and believes that somehow and somewhere the struggle will issue in the victory of virtue; the soul that is athirst for God will one day slake its thirst; "the pure in heart see God." And she instanced "Henry Grey," *alias* T. H. Green, as an illustration of the effect on the life of a good man of this "new construction of Christianity." It is the argument of Huxley in one of his letters to Kingsley: "For long years I have been slowly and painfully climbing with many a fall towards better things." Mr Gladstone dissented; any religion, new or old, must be judged by its effects on the broad masses of the people, the "twice-born," not the "once-born" like T. H. Green. Such men as he, with their happy moral and spiritual constitution, buttressed by the habits and traditions of Christian forebears, fortified by the restraints of culture and society, are no fair test. "Goodness itself may in one sense be a snare." Elect spirits like Green and Martineau "would have been better if they had been worse." Their philanthropic enthusiasm would never survive "the test of practice in great communities."

(*b*) This distinction between those who are or need to be "born again" and the "once-born" is, as the ascetical theologians emphasize, the crux of the Christian gospel and the heart of the cultus, ritual, and worship of the churches. It seems to have formed the bridge by which Gladstone and Mrs Ward passed on to the more historical region: the origins and development of the "primitive" interpretations of the person and work of the Founder of Christianity. It is of interest that in this region neither of the combatants felt assured that the other had really "covered the ground." From Keble, Mr Gladstone writes to Mrs Gladstone that Mrs Ward had got "her Catechism of half-research cut and dry" and had apparently

confined her "critical" study to the "negative" side, while Mrs Ward noted privately that she thought Mr Gladstone "was not really familiar with the literature of the subject." Such secret suspicions are very human and very common and very true—learning is long and life is short. In this particular instance, however, we may agree, for reasons already stated, that between them these two controversialists had attained by much study and reflection a reasonable title to discuss a problem whose solution involves almost equally *à priori* presuppositions and technical scholarship. That they had in the end "to agree to disagree" is not surprising; the historico-technical enquiry is still far from settlement. But in respect of the more immediate issue, how to enable the intelligentsia to feel at home in the National Establishment, it may be said that the statesman and the novelist did agree on the superiority of Anglicanism over all other Christian theologies and polities. In other words if, as is the case, Mrs Ward continued right to the end of her life in her endeavour to broaden the basis of the Church of England, she did so on ground provided for her by Mr Gladstone. We may briefly recount the heads of his argument.

In the *Contemporary* article Mr Gladstone had diagnosed historic Christianity as having developed in and through three main "schools": the Papal or Ultramontane, the Historical, and the Protestant Evangelical. As to the first little need be said; it may be assumed Mrs Ward knew of and shared in Mr Gladstone's sentiments on Papalism and Infallibility as deployed in the two tracts of 1874 and 1875. Like him she deplored its clericalism and denial of the rights of the laity, its rejection of new learning and hostility to free thought, its consequent inroads on intellectual and moral veracity and alienation from the educated minds of the countries under its rule. This said, it should be also said that in his interchanges with Mrs Ward, Mr Gladstone admitted and emphasized the fact that the Papal system with its hard outlines and systematic thoroughness is happily adapted to "the babes and sucklings of the Gospel, the poor and weak, the uninstructed, the simple souls who in tranquil spheres give the heart and will to God and whose shady path is not scorched by the burning questions of human thought and life." Protestant Evangelicalism rejects the Papal monarchy and the visible church, but holds to the great central dogmas of the Christian system. Again, with refreshing candour, Mr Gladstone extols the magnificent contribution of Protestantism to the modern world: its devotion to liberty, theological and civil, its pastoral and missionary energy, its expansion where it has taken root away from "the chilling shadow of national establishments of religion" as in America and the British Colonies. Yet the Evangelical school has not found it easy to safeguard itself from Calvinistic and other distortions, from interpolations of various excrescences perhaps imposed by a popular preacher or prophet, and from an apparently incurable tendency to further and further severances in outward communion. The Historical school also rejects the Papal monarchy but affirms the visibility of the church—that is, of a society founded by our

Lord and the apostles to teach and administer sacraments, kept through many a lapse and error in possession of all essential truth, and disallowing "palpable innovations" introduced since the age of the lawful councils whose declarations were "sealed by the general acceptance of the faithful." Such is the basis of the Orthodox or Eastern Churches, of the Old Catholics, of the Liberal Catholics still endeavouring to exist within the Latin Church, of the Church of England and its offshoots, while even within Protestantism there are or were representatives of this school, as Casaubon, Grotius, and Leibnitz. These various "wings" of the school offer targets for easy criticism: they are unfortunately severed from one another and they lack the organizational directness and simplicity of the papal and calvinist systems. But on the other hand they exhibit the inestimable qualities of mental freedom, they respect history and tradition, they are moderate in their theory and practice of ecclesiastical authority. The English Church is one expression of this school since its standard authorities proceed on the assertion or assumption that the church is a visible society or congregation and since the episcopal succession was preserved against great odds in this country during the Reformation period. Visibility and Succession are not, as Lord Macaulay and others have asserted, the "crotchets of the High Church Party"; they have constituted the formative influence on the Anglican Churches from Queen Elizabeth onwards.

Such briefly and in tabloid form was Mr Gladstone's defence of that Church in which both he and Mrs Ward were numbered among the faithful. So far as the printed records go they never met again. But "life is meeting," and it would be strange if that passing encounter of these two thoughtful, disciplined and Christian souls held no significance even for so different a set of circumstances as our own today. When two intelligent people meet and argue and seem to reach no agreed conclusion that does not mean that there is in fact no deeper ground of agreement and reconciliation yet to come, Time has an Hegelian habit of adding antithesis to thesis and synthesis to both. It was so here, and the point or area of congruence is that both controversialists did in fact anticipate the shape of things-to-come in Church and State in England. Looking back over the fifty years since Mr Gladstone died we can see that two processes have developed, both of which were foreseen by him and that one of them shows Time responding to Mrs Ward's hope that the future would see the diffusion of the simple ideas of Christian brotherhood among the masses.

(*a*) In Anglican (and other) philosophic theology the emphasis on revelation, tradition, dogma, and visibility has increased; liberalism is suspect and the immanental idealism expounded in Balliol classrooms in the nineties has been out of favour for a generation—discarded by the apologists in favour of neo-Thomism or Barthianism or Biblicism, while Anglo-Catholicism is passing beyond the age of Gore or Illingworth or Scott Holland. Here at this high (or deep)

level Time has adjudicated in favour of "Weg" and against "Bobbie" and his Elsmerean theology.

(*b*) On the other hand, Mrs Ward has been justified in her prophecies of an increasing drift of the intellectuals from dogmatic and credal Christianity; the evidence if unwelcome is overwhelming. Where parents of the professional and educated classes do continue to take their children to be baptized and allow them to be confirmed at school the strong presumption is that they do so, as Mrs Ward suggested, from indolence or timidity or levity. Such persons, so far as they are sincere, are living, as Dean Sperry has remarked of the situation in the States, on the dogmatic capital of their fathers, and when they die there will be little left to hand on to their children, while these in their turn will be even farther removed from the hold of early and adolescent instruction and habit. So here Mrs Ward has it; the score seems one all.

But perhaps 1948 is not the end of the match; perhaps it is only half-time, and in another fifty years, when Mr Gladstone will have been dead a whole century, Time may have reversed the decision reached in 1948. It was in 1868 that Mr Gladstone admitted, or rather strongly emphasized, that as the State had grown less theological it had grown more Christian. He appealed to the evidence of the three preceding decades (1838-1868) as demonstrating that "its consciousness of moral duty had been quickened and enhanced," that there had been a steady growth in public recognition of "the laws of relative right and the brotherhood of man," and that there was a firmer maintenance of "the great outlines and fences of moral action." Such a thesis coming from such a quarter is not lightly to be controverted nor its implications for both ecclesiastical and political science to be disregarded. For the process has surely not slackened since 1868 or 1898; the State (or Society operating through great voluntary associations) is fulfilling Mrs Ward's program of clothing "the simple Christian ideas" (of service, kindness, brotherhood, equality, and the like) "in large charitable and social organizations."

Taking these two processes together then, it would seem that if Mr Gladstone and Mrs Ward could have anticipated the development of theory and practice, of general outlook and legislation, in twentieth-century England their interchanges might have ended in mutual congratulation and encouragement. Time held in her box a prize for each. The Church has become more not less firm in her theology; the State has become more not less basically Christian in its corporate implementation of that great commandment which is the ground of all lesser duties. The English State of today has certainly no lack of men and women able and willing to find in her service a vocation recognizably moral and religious in its motives and sanctions, while the National Establishment of religion, though in some ways less imposing and shorn of many of her "civil and proprietary rights, privileges, and prerogatives," is by common consent better able to fulfil her specific function through "progressive adaptations of her state and laws to her ever-enlarging exigencies."

Gladstone's assertion of his "inmost conviction" to Manning in 1846 remains true: "She will live through her struggles, she has a great providential destiny before her." W. G. C. Addison.

Germany Revisited

Five days in the enthusiastic and inspiring atmosphere of an Evangelische Woche at Flensburg on the Danish frontier; the inside of a week at a Predigerseminar at Kupferhammer near Brackwede, where a group of German theological students had gathered for a brief vacation course (partly to learn about the Church of England), to be followed by a group of jurists, to whom one of our number sought, in the face of some bewilderment, to set out in an hour's paper the intricacies of the constitutional structure of *ecclesia anglicana*; a conference of sixteen German and Anglican theologians at Iserlohn, with as many papers in four days; several personal contacts, mainly at the three University centres of Göttingen, Bonn, and Münster; and, for some of us, the opportunity of taking part in the centenary celebrations of the Inner Mission at Bethel near Bielefeld, all incidents in a visit to the British Zone of Germany last September, have left some impressions which it may be worth while trying to record. The dangers that face any foreign visitor who will draw general conclusions are enhanced when the theological traditions of two peoples are as different as those of England and Germany, and intercourse has been cut off for a decade. But our warm welcome and carefully thought-out program[1] gave us a somewhat unusual opportunity of sharing in the religious life of contemporary German Protestantism. Our full time-table did not leave us much scope for contact with non-Protestants; but we saw something of the religious life of the Roman Catholic Church, and were especially impressed by the large congregations at the daily Masses, sometimes at a very early hour, also by the active part taken by the congregation in the liturgy almost all of which was sometimes recited aloud in the vernacular by a leading member of the congregation.[2] Three of us also had the good fortune to spend a Sunday at Bonn, the headquarters of the Old Catholic Church in Germany, where we were received by the Pastor and joined in the worship of the small but active community.

The shape and structure of Church life in Protestant Germany

[1] The visit was planned by the Religious Affairs Branch of the Control Commission, to whom sincere thanks are due for the excellence of the arrangements, particularly to the Rev. H. P. Kingdon. The German team at Iserlohn consisted of Oberkirchenrat Dr J. Beckmann (Düsseldorf), Pastor J. Doehring (Hermannsburg), Prof. K. H. Rengstorf (Münster i.W.), Prof. H. Schlingensiepen (Bonn), Pastor U. Smidt (Bremerhaven), Prof. K. D. Schmidt (Hermannsburg), Dr G. Stratenwerth (Höchst a.M.), and Prof. O. Weber (Göttingen); the English team of the Revs. H. Chadwick, J. O. Cobham, F. de Jonge, Canon S. L. Greenslade, Dr T. G. Jalland, J. N. Sanders, G. C. Stead, and the present writer.

[2] On Sundays, Masses in the late afternoon are still common. The Münster at Bonn was filled to capacity for a Mass at 7 p.m. A three hours' fast is required of communicants, of whom on the occasion mentioned there were about thirty.

are still dominated by the *Kirchenkampf*. We heard innumerable tales of suffering and the constant threats of imprisonment in the five or six years from 1933 onwards; but the struggle seems to have been carried on with much good heart and more than a little of the spice of naughtiness, and certainly did much to infuse fresh life and a new spirit of comradeship into the Church. Among the more scrupulous in a Church which had always laid excessive stress on the duty of submission to secular authority the conflict of loyalties raised many problems of conscience. The difficulty of knowing where to draw the line, and perhaps having one's motives misinterpretated as due to lack of courage, often led to tangled situations. Indeed, individual pastors seemed to us sometimes overscrupulous in their self-accusations about their personal decisions at critical stages in the struggle. But it is evident that the *Kirchenkampf* remains in the memory of contemporary German Protestantism a time of great spiritual renewal.

With the outbreak of war the situation eased. On the one side the general dislocation made a continuance of the conflict on existing lines impossible; on the other the State itself appears to have become rather more conciliatory in its wish to let the conflict drop. The change in attitude is reflected in the fact that when von Bodelschwingh and others protested against the *Rassenpolitischen Amt's* decree condemning vast numbers of the aged and mentally afflicted to "euthanasia," the powers that be did not carry their policy through in the Evangelical hospitals. In other directions war conditions did much to restrict the influence of the Confessing Church.[1] With the all-round restriction of publications, it was easy to suppress its organ *Junge Kirche*, which ceased in 1941. The Confessing Theological Colleges were also closed as the demands on manpower for military purposes increased.

The psychological effects of the defeat of 1945 were everywhere overwhelming. Yet the reaction of the Church seems to have differed from that of the people as a whole. The more reflective were conscious that amidst the immense physical destruction and intellectual void created by the sudden collapse of Nazi ideals, the Church alone possessed something positive to offer. As regards immediate problems, there was an undoubted sense of relief at the overthrow of Nazism, and many Churchmen were not without hopes that the Western powers would rule the country on Christian principles and give the Churches a measure of leadership. Such hopes were not based on self-congratulation. The Stuttgart "Confession of Guilt," drawn up in October, 1945, largely through the instrumentality of Bishop Wurm and signed by other members of the Council of the Evangelical Church,[2] was sincerely meant. It was the catastrophic

[1] This is the title (*"Bekennende Kirche"*) by which the body should be known. The title commonly used in pre-war days by English writers, viz. the *"Confessional* Church," is confusing; for the title *Bekenntnis-Kirchen* is more appropriate to the Churches which take their stand on the traditional sixteenth-century confessions.

[2] Text in S. Herman, *The Rebirth of the German Church* (1946), p. 137.

events and complete uncertainty about the future which created an apocalyptic state of mind and gave to many a fresh meaning to belief in the Second Advent.[1] With the destiny of Germany still obscure, the belief persists that the present is an age of great decision and that the Church is called to a mission of historic significance.

Recently a great step forward has been made towards the achievement of one of the first practical tasks before the Church, the need for constitutional reorganization. The traditional organization of the German *Landeskirchen*, as modified after the overthrow of the "Princes" in 1918 (the most notable step was the creation of the *Kirchenbund* at Wittenberg in May, 1922), finally ceased to be effective from 1933 onwards. It is true that when Hitler sought to reconstitute these *Landeskirchen* as the "Deutsch-Evangelische Kirche" on the basis of the Führerprinzip, the Confessing Pastors set up their own organization. But it was the reconstruction of the *Landeskirchen*, under Reichbischof Ludwig Müller, which was structurally the real descendant of the older Protestant Churches, and after 1945 the remains of this organization shed its Nazi elements and its federalist elements again became prominent. The Confessing Church, on the other hand, which had existed as an independent body since the assembly at Ulm Cathedral in April, 1934, had been interterritorial and now stood for the principle of unity. There was also theological divergence. As against the separate confessions of the *Landeskirchen*, the Confessing Church took its stand on the Barmen Declaration of May, 1934, with its proclamation that the Church knows of nothing but "the One Word of God," namely, "Jesus Christ as He is testified to us in Holy Scripture," as the revelation of God.

Events of the last few months give ground for hope that a satisfactory reorganization will soon be achieved. Most of the *Landeskirchen* have long recognized that some greater unification is needed than was provided partly by the *Kirchentag*, which has met annually since 1848, and partly by the smaller meeting of the heads of Churches, originally known as the "Eisenach Conference" (later the "German Evangelical Church Committee"), held from 1852 onwards. Hitherto the chief obstacle has been that almost all the various *Landeskirchen* have been jealous of their own traditions. And not only were Lutherans, Reformed, and United confessionally different, but over against all was the Confessing Church. These difficulties were virtually overcome at a Constituent Assembly of the twenty-eight Regional Churches (that is, of all the German Protestant communions except small bodies such as the Baptists and Methodists) held at Eisenach last July. Largely through the indefatigable efforts of Bishop Wurm, a single Constitution received general approval and the administrative organ of the Confessing Church, known as the *Bruderrat* agreed to dissolve itself. In the matter of theology the language of the Barmen Declaration was endorsed. On the subject of intercommunion a compromise was adopted.

[1] It was stated that at a different level "Jehovah's Witnesses" had secured a considerable following in Germany since the *Zusammenbruch*.

Lutheran and Reformed. Pastors may admit to the Sacrament members of the other Confession where they so wish, but such admission is not of itself to be understood as a transference of Confessional allegiance and no pastor is required so to act if he has conscientious scruples. When, as is hoped, the new Constitution receives formal ratification in the separate Churches, the provisional administration of the last fourteen years will have ended.

There can be no doubt about the vigorous life of contemporary German Lutheranism.[1] Compared with England, the impression created was that religious influences were less widely diffused, but where alive went much deeper. Perhaps the most patent difference which strikes an Englishman is the stronger "theological" emphasis. Worship centres in the preaching of "the Word," and the sermon thus has an essentially liturgical character.[2] This emphasis on the Word leads to stress on Biblical exegesis, which can reach a very high level. The fine exposition of the first chapters of Genesis by Dr Hertzberg, Professor of Old Testament Theology at Kiel, at Flensburg, or of sections of the New Testament interpreted by Pastor Hans Thimme at the Predigerseminar at Kupferhammer will not soon be forgotten by those who heard them. The radical contrast between the sublimity and purity of faith and the sinfulness of the world is everywhere vividly felt. Modern conditions have increased the inwardness and separateness of faith. We were told that the present generation of theological students, returning to their studies after many years of varied experience, is anxious for nothing so much as to turn its back on contemporary secular life and build up its religious faith and practice on a purely theological basis. It is hoped in this way to bring order and strength into personal religion. It is easy to understand and admire this attitude; but even some of those sympathetic to it recognized that it tended to create an outlook which had too few points of contact with the every-day modes of thought of the parishes and communities which they would later have to serve.

German Protestantism, in common with most other parts of contemporary Christendom, has also been deeply influenced by the growing sense of the Church. The change, already foreshadowed in the inter-war period by Barth's altered title from *Christliche Dogmatik*[3] to *Kirchliche Dogmatik*[4] goes on. The idea that the Apostolic Age was a church-free era (*Kirchenfreie Zeit*; Harnack, Sohm) is now universally repudiated. But the new *Kirchlichkeit* is a *Kirchlichkeit* of the Word, since on Lutheran principles the Church can have no independent authority. It derives its authority from the Bible and stands under the Word. Similarly, while the need for a renewed

[1] Our contacts were mainly with the Lutheran Churches, though it may perhaps be presumed that conditions are similar among the Reformed.

[2] It was pointed out that the English sermon, by contrast, often struck German visitors to England as somewhat casual in its form.

[3] *Die Christliche Dogmatik im Entwurf*, vol. i (all published): Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes, 1927.

[4] To date three vols. (1932 ff.), each in two parts. The latest volume carries the subject as far as *"Die Schöpfung"* (*sic!*).

sacramental theology is recognized, it is insisted that this, too, must be a sacramentalism of the Word. The question of Baptism, recently brought into prominence through Karl Barth's critique of Infant Baptism in his Gwatt Lecture on *Die kirchliche Lehre von der Taufe* (1943),[1] is attracting widespread attention from the pastoral angle.[2] But the Sacraments can be understood only as expressive of the Word. As Barth puts it in the lecture mentioned, Baptism "is neither God, nor Jesus Christ, nor the Covenant, nor Grace, nor the Church." "It bears witness to all these as the event in which God in Jesus Christ makes a man His child and a member of His covenant, awakening faith through His grace and calling a man to life in the Church." Or as Luther has it in the *Larger Catechism*, it is "God's Word in Water."[3] The feeling is also widespread that the Lord's Supper (*Abendmahl*) fills in ordinary German life a wholly insufficient place. But this revived Sacramentalism as a Sacramentalism of the Word is not bound up with any belief in a special grace in the ministry. The idea of apostolic succession is wholly foreign to Lutheran belief, and it would be a mistake to see theological significance in the creation of new bishoprics in Germany. It is insisted that the Bishop's office is a *Hilfsamt*, not a *Herrscheramt*, be he called a "Bishop" or "President" or by any other title.

A satisfactory solution of the place of the Church in the emergent new social and political structure is hampered by the inherited Lutheran doctrine of the authority of the State. Constructive political action is contrary to the whole Lutheran tradition. It is well known how even in pre-1914 days this doctrine of subjection to the civil power cut the Church apart from the Social Democrats, who consequently have always been atheistically inclined. This is now a serious and unfortunate factor with the present influence of the Social Democratic Party (often considered to be that most akin to our Socialist Party), and has led to widespread suppression of the Confessional Schools. The traditional doctrine of submission, so deeply rooted in the Lutheran mentality, survived the overthrow of the "Princes" in 1918, and did much to weaken the resistance of the Church to the Nazi *régime*. Recently there are signs of a less purely passive theory.[4] In an interesting brochure, *Ein Evangelisches Wort zur Lage* (Hamburg, August, 1948), Friedrich Heitmüller insists that

[1] *The Teaching of the Church regarding Baptism*, English trans. by E. A. Payne S.C.M., 1948. The principal reply is *Die Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments* by the eminent Basle Theologian, Dr Oscar Cullmann (in *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und des Neuen Testaments*, No. 12; Zürich, Zwingli Verlag, 1948).

[2] There was evidence of a strong feeling in some quarters against indiscriminate Baptism. Particular dissatisfaction was felt about the current method of Confirmation, which is only too often in practice the *terminus* of a boy's or girl's association with the Church, popularly known as *Konfirmirung aus der Kirche*. It was far more a family than a religious event.

[3] Quoted, p. 18. Barth criticizes, however, the specifically Lutheran teaching that the baptismal water through its union with the Word acquires a peculiar power as the *aqua vitæ* (p. 22 f.).

[4] The change was already foreshadowed by Barth's *Rechtfertigung und Recht* (1938) (English version, *Church and State*, S.C.M., 1939).

the Church has active duties towards the State, and that it is her mission to proclaim to it the Will of God; for while the "sword" is entrusted to the State, it is to the Church (*die Gemeinde*) and not the State that the Will of God is revealed. As against the traditional Lutheran stress on Rom. 13 as the sole regulative passage of Scripture, Heitmüller insists that this must be understood in the light of what the Gospels tell of Christ's own attitude and such places as Acts iv, 19 *f*. He points out that as an *Erhaltungsordnung*, the State cannot claim a wholly unquestioning obedience (*Kadavergehorsam*). Yet he will not allow that it is in any circumstances right for the Church to further a political revolution. As one speaker at Iserlohn urged, this fact alone makes it impossible for a Christian to associate himself with Marxist socialism.

As regards theological studies in the narrower sense, the last fourteen years have had shattering effects. The best students were attracted away from the Universities to the private Confessing *Theologische Hochschulen*, where the calibre of their teaching staff was not equalled by corresponding facilities for advanced work. At the Universities the numbers of theologians steadily declined in the years before the war. Recently numbers have begun to rise again rapidly. In the Summer Semester of 1946 there were 1,413; in that of 1947, 2,090; and in the Winter Semester of 1947-8, 2,491. But it is clear from these figures[1] that it will take long to make up the leeway. The destruction of buildings and libraries remains a serious hindrance to work.[2]

Hopes have not been abandoned of continuing many of the pre-war works of scholarship. Since the outbreak of war the fourth volume of Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* has been completed and plans are in hand for further fascicules. The end of the Nazi *régime* will have removed certain practical difficulties in the way of accepting contributions from at least one distinguished scholar. Gerhard Kittel himself died in July of last year.

Patristic studies have been specially hardly hit through the war, which made a heavy toll on a promising group of young Patristic scholars, largely pupils of Hans Lietzmann (died June 25th, 1942).[3] Hans-Georg Opitz died on the Eastern front in 1941. Since his death the Berlin *Athanasius* has been entrusted to Pastor Wilhelm Schneemelcher of Göttingen. There is reason to believe that the concluding fascicule of Vol. II will be published shortly under the immediate

[1] In the Summer Semesters of 1932, 1933, 1936, and 1939 the total numbers of theological students at the German Universities were respectively 7,085, 6,791, 3,183, and 1,330. For the second Trimester of 1940 there had been a fall to 319. I take these figures from the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* of February, 1948, cols. 107-8.

[2] Of the four Protestant Universities with theological faculties in the British Zone, Göttingen alone is unharmed. Bonn, Münster, and Kiel have all suffered severely. Hamburg and Cologne do not possess theological faculties.

[3] Gedächtnisrede (H. Bornkamm) and Bibliography (K. Aland; 490 items) in *Z.N.T.W.*, xli (1942), pp. 1-33. A fourth volume of Lietzmann's *Geschichte der alten Kirche* ("Die Zeit der Kirchenväter") appeared in 1944.

direction of Walther Eltester; and there is also hope that the *Urkunden* in Vol. III will be continued. But progress is bound to be slow and work on Vol I seems to have been postponed indefinitely. Pastor Schneemelcher is also engaged on the concluding (index) volume of the Berlin (*G.C.S.*) Epiphanius left uncompleted by Karl Holl. Most of the MS. was saved and parts of the volume are well in hand, so that we may look forward to the appearance at not too distant a date of what will be an invaluable tool for Patristic studies. Of other *G.C.S.* volumes Eusebius' *Præparatio Evangelii* was said to be ready for publication, and important progress with the *Clementines* (Recognitions and Homilies) and Vol. II of the *Koptisch-Gnostischen Schriften* was reported. Another "Lieferung" of the *Lexicon Athanasianum* is in the press. Eduard Schwartz's *Acta conciliorum Œcumenicorum* remains uncompleted.[1] Of great interest to both Patristic and Biblical students will be a new edition (the 4th) of W. Bauer's *N T Wörterbuch* which is due for early publication. If (perhaps *per impossibile*) this edition represents an advance on its immediate predecessor corresponding to that made by each of the previous editions, it will be a splendid work indeed. It is rumoured that Dr Bauer has important new parallels to resolve the doubts of those who object to a work with an ending of the form ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ (Mark xvi, 8).

But since the *Zusammenbruch* publication has so far been mainly confined to less technical fields. A wealth of new publications of a practical character is helping to fill the void created by wholesale destruction. Dr Hans Ehrenberg's many English friends will welcome his *Vom Menschen*, Biblisch und Aktuell (Gladbeck, 1948), dedicated to the "Arbeitsgemeinschaft über Naturrecht zu Hawarden in England." Among the more influential teachers of Systematic Theology who addresses himself directly to the situation is Professor Edmund Schlink of Tübingen. His collection of papers, *Bekennende Kirche und Welt*, Vorträge und Predigten aus den Jahren 1934 bis 1945,[2] will remain a useful historic document. Of more solid work the chief are in the field of Dogmatic Theology. A comprehensive two-volume treatise by the distinguished Lutheran theologian, D. Paul Althaus of Erlangen, *Die Christliche Wahrheit*,[3] has recently appeared, and of systematic import also is E. Schlink's *Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften*.[4] A useful introduction to New Testament Theology has begun to appear under the title of *Die Botschaft des Evangeliums* from Dr Martin Albertz,[5] a book which

[1] Schwartz died in 1940. See Albert Rehm's valuable study of his work, with bibliography (387 items), "Eduard Schwartz' wissenschaftliches Lebenswerk" *S.B. der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Abt., 1948 Heft 4.

[2] Furche Verlag, Tübingen, 1947.

[3] Two vols. Chr. Bertelsman Verlag, Gütersloh, 1947-8.

[4] New edition 1946, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München. This seems to be a reprint of a first edition (1040), probably destroyed. It was reviewed by Mr Gordon Rupp in THEOLOGY, November, 1948, p. 437.

[5] Vol. I (i) published by the Zollikon Verlag, Zurich, 1947. A reprint (in much inferior dress) has appeared in Germany (?1948).

has an added personal interest in that it was largely written while the author, one of the pioneers of *formgeschichtliche* study of the Gospels, was in prison. After two and a half years' suspension the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* began to appear again in July, 1947, under the editorship of Professor Kurt Aland.[1]

In conclusion, two comments of a general character may be ventured.

First, in the rebuilding of German life and culture, great possibilities lie open to the Church. Foreign observers, who in pre-war days may have been a little uncertain about the real strength of the Church's opposition to National Socialism and perhaps have questioned whether the rift was not magnified by propagandists, can now rest assured of the toughness of the resistance from 1933 onwards. The *Kirchenkampf* indubitably grew out of the conviction that the Nazi *régime* was a system in the grip of the powers of spiritual evil and as such to be resisted to the uttermost. Among many who were not themselves active members of the Church or had not themselves the moral courage to join in the *Kampf*, the Church won respect as a bulwark of intellectual freedom. Much goodwill towards the Church continues to exist in consequence, especially as it is one of the few institutions with a definite sense of purpose in Germany today. In so far, its potentialities as a real reconstructive force for the education of Germany from within are enormous. The Church and her leaders deserve every encouragement from all concerned with the reconstruction of German life on sound foundations, and this as soon as may be, for as recollection of the part which the Church played in the Third Reich becomes dimmer, the goodwill that now exists will fade away.

Secondly, in attempts to establish and further friendly relations between Anglicanism and German Protestantism, nothing should be done to minimize the difference between the two traditions. German Protestantism was cast by its sixteenth-century Reformers in a very definite mould, which has a *Geist* all its own. Its individuality is of a piece with that of a particular style of architecture or art—and, it need scarcely be added, very much more—and has its own value; and it would be a wrong ideal for those who would wish to further contacts between Anglicanism and German Protestantism to endeavour along the lines of a misconceived ecumenicalism to smooth out these differences. It is these differences which are provocative of new questions on both sides, and it is here that contact with German Protestantism can be of most service to Anglicanism. Hence though in such matters as social relief work and historical scholarship where there is nothing to divide us co-operation can be unlimited, in the realm of faith the present task is for each Church to preserve its integrity in the spirit of charity

F. L. Cross.

[1] The last copy so far (October, 1948) in the Bodleian is that for March, 1948. Whether the delay is due only to the difficulties of communication from the Russian Zone I cannot say.

Theology and Agriculture

REASONS THAT JUSTIFY THE TEACHING OF AGRICULTURAL PRINCIPLES IN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES AND THEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES IN AGRICULTURAL AND HORTICULTURAL COLLEGES

[NOTE.—The Christian community in Nigeria is rural, and the future wellbeing of the Christian Church there depends, in large part, upon a sound, progressive, and balanced development of that community. At Asaba, under the Rev. Kenneth Prior, the C.M.S., the Church of Scotland Mission, and the Methodist Mission are participating in a considerable experiment in rural development. At the back of this experiment is the need for giving clear expression to the inter-relation of theology and agriculture. The notes below were drafted by Mr Prior, and are published here (and in America) in the hope that they will receive criticism, which should be sent to the Rev. K. Prior, Rural Training Centre, Asaba, Nigeria.]

THE only significant religion is one which starts where man is, and with the facts and the problems of that concrete situation, and goes with man whatever he does and whatever he meets. No real religion will submit to detachment from life, because the real world knows nothing of watertight compartments, and religion is man's response to the single meaning of his total environment—a response expressing itself in worship, personal committal, and conduct.

Conduct is a function of environment, which differs for each country and for each type of community in each country. There can therefore be no stereotyped transmission of religion.

The teacher can lead only when he relates the meaning of what is committed to him to the setting of those with whom he has to do. And in consequence merely academic theological training is inadequate, and usually misleading. Knowledge is required not only of theology, but also of local community, culture, and thought-forms.

Because conduct is a function of environment, good husbandry, which is one mode of man's dealing with environment, is entirely and unavoidably religious, and is as much a positive moral obligation as is the precept to love our neighbour, which is another mode of dealing with environment.

Therefore, the exploitation or spoliation of soil or stock by any means whatsoever are sins against our neighbour, against posterity, against the natural order, and against God whose it all is, and whose instruments and agents we are for its right use.

The Bible illuminates the moral factors involved in agriculture, and it is only in terms of rural and agricultural knowledge and sympathies that the Bible can be understood and taught.

When so understood the sin of bad husbandry is clear; and the contradiction is exposed which lies in the inner life of one who claims to be a Christian (with all that is thereby implied for moral conduct) but yet is indifferent to the moral claims upon him of stock and soil. There is no logical difference between acquiescence

in bad farming and acquiescence in unchastity. Both alike are wrong dealing with environment.

Consequently those who, as ministers, are "messengers, stewards, and watchmen of the Lord," and are ordained to lead and to teach His people, must know the principles involved in the work and life of the people committed to their charge. If conduct is right dealing with environment, right conduct cannot be explained and taught by one who has no knowledge of environment. This applies to rural life in exactly the same way as it applies to economic and industrial life, or to the complex relationships of men and women which are the foundation of the home. The training of a Christian minister is incomplete unless it equips him to lead, to advise, and to admonish in a rural community. He must be alive to ways in which his people can fall into sin, and that means that he must know the principles of good husbandry.

When religion and husbandry are thus recognized as inseparable the reward is great, alike for the deepening and understanding of religion as for the appreciation of and reverence for the soil, and for an incentive to improve technical skill, and to set the economic problem properly in its own natural moral context.

Modern agriculture has neglected this fact, and has sought to put asunder what God has joined, to its own detriment and that of religion. Therefore agricultural principles should be taught in theological colleges, and theological principles in horticultural and agricultural colleges; and it is in the farm home that these two lines most noticeably intersect.

Arthur Cayley Headlam and the Fourth Gospel

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AS HISTORY. By A. C. Headlam. Late Bishop of Gloucester. With a Biographical Essay by Agnes Headlam-Morley. Basil Blackwell. 7s. 6d.

BISHOP HEADLAM, so we are told in the admirable biographical essay which forms the first half of this volume, after his retirement from the see of Gloucester at the age of eighty, "returned with renewed zest to his New Testament studies, which had been interrupted but never entirely superseded by administrative work. He planned to produce a fuller and more complete edition of the Life of Christ." This volume contains introductory studies on the Fourth Gospel, which he finished a week before he died. The manuscript was marked "unrevised." The studies deal with the aim and purpose of the Gospel; the historical value of its incidents; the external and internal evidence for the authorship; and the nature of its teaching: and they are followed by an essay on "The Historical Value of St Mark's Gospel," which was published in the *Church Quarterly Review* in 1946.

Headlam recognizes that the Fourth Gospel is an apologetic and theological work and not a biography; but maintains that it is not unhistorical. The incidents it records not only happened, but hap-

pened in the manner described; for they are recorded by one who was an eye-witness, the Apostle John, "the disciple whom Jesus loved." The Gospel is not, however, chronological, for the order of the events is conditioned by the author's greater concern "with the meaning of the words and actions of Jesus than with their original setting or relative order." Here Headlam parts company with Westcott and also with those critics who have attempted to rearrange the text with a view to producing a better chronology. He was too good a textual critic not to feel convinced that, so well preserved is the text of the New Testament, any major dislocations would have left some trace in the various lines of evidence which are available to us. He finds little difficulty himself in making room within the Marcan outline of the story of Jesus for the incidents recorded only in the Fourth Gospel, but it is doubtful whether some of the arguments, which he uses in defence of this position, will appear convincing to any but the most conservative scholars.

Headlam shows himself at his best in his thorough, and for the most part dispassionate, handling of the difficult external evidence for the authorship. Younger scholars today are apt to be somewhat impatient at this kind of introductory study. Headlam, however, was too good an historian not to pay the greatest attention to the sifting of early evidence, and he was scornful of those who dismissed or treated in arbitrary fashion what the writers of the early Church believed. "The theologians of the early Church were as able a body of men as the critics and theologians of the nineteenth and twentieth century." He passes well-merited judgment upon the powers of historical discernment displayed by those who would accept the late and confused evidence for the early martyrdom of the Apostle John, but lays himself open to criticism for his over-simplification of the problem of the identity of John of Ephesus by eliminating altogether John the Elder. The well-known evidence of Papias, interpreted by Eusebius as implying the existence of John the Elder as distinct from John the Apostle can, in Headlam's view equally well, and with greater probability, be understood to mean that the Elder is classified amongst the original disciples of the Lord; the word "Elder" being used not in its technical sense for an official of the local church, but "as a term of respect for those elderly men whose age and position gave them authority."

If John the Elder *can* be thus eliminated, the external evidence for the Apostolic authorship is very strong. Equally strong is the internal evidence, provided that we can accept the words of xxi, 24 as evidence that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" was the author of the whole Gospel. This verse is clearly from another hand than that of the author, and presumably is the affidavit of the Church of Ephesus, given at the time when the Gospel was published, that the book was Apostolic. Headlam carries conviction when he argues that identification of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" with John the son of Zebedee is much the most probable identification. He never, however, asks whether it is not more probable that a disciple of the Apostle should refer to his master in such a manner, than that the

Apostle should so designate himself. The case for the Gospel being the work of a disciple of the Apostle is not discussed.

Headlam conjectures that John the Apostle was the disciple whom Jesus chose as His companion on His visits to Jerusalem at the Jewish Festivals, and that this accounts for the special knowledge he possesses of what happened on those occasions. But if this conjecture is correct, I find it difficult to understand why there is no mention of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" earlier than the last supper. He also believes that the words of Mark x, 1—"And he arose from thence, and cometh into the borders of Judæa and beyond Jordan: and multitudes come together unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again"—imply a considerable ministry of Jesus in trans-Jordania and Judæa before the final journey to Jerusalem; and that John, but not Peter, was with Jesus on this tour. Peter (and therefore Mark) did not give details about this part of the ministry, because he had no knowledge of it. John fills in the gaps from his own memory, so that the contents of John vii-xi can be assumed to have taken place during the ministry referred to in Mark x, 1.

This seems to me to be an unjustifiable over-simplification of the problem. Referring to this Judæan ministry, Headlam writes: "So far as we can gather, Peter did not go with Jesus on the journey through Judæa. He is never mentioned in any of the narratives of this mission, and he met Jesus again at Jericho. The same is true probably of many other of the disciples. James and John, the sons of Zebedee, were with their Master, and so was Thomas, but we do not hear of any others." But assuming, as Headlam does, that Mark is written in chronological sequence, the narrative of chapter ten plainly asserts the presence of Peter during this period. In verse 1 we are told of a renewal by Jesus of a ministry to the multitudes in trans-Jordania, and the presumption surely is that the next incidents took place during that ministry—viz., the teaching about divorce, the welcoming of the little children, the question about the conditions of entrance into eternal life, the teaching about the danger of riches, and the statement by *Peter*, "Lo we have left all and followed thee." At verse 32 we have the picture of the *twelve* following their Master disconsolately to Jerusalem; and when Jericho is reached in verse 46, there is no mention of Peter rejoining the party. To deny all this is to deny the validity of the Petrine origin of the Gospel, which is the very last thing that Headlam is prepared to do. And it is just because the upholders of the strict "Marcan hypothesis" are driven to the kind of conjectures that Headlam here makes, that the theory of the origin of the Gospel of Mark put forward by the Form-critics seems to many to be more satisfactory.

Headlam assumes that the incidents of the Fourth Gospel are historically true, because they are written by an eye-witness, who reveals himself to be such by his vivid style and his accurate knowledge of the topography, particularly of Jerusalem before its destruction. In my judgment he does not allow sufficiently for the influence of the theological aim of the evangelist, which he acknowledges, upon the manner in which the narratives are recorded. He writes,

for example, about the miracle at Cana of the changing of water int wine: "We find no hint of any theological meaning and a simple and straightforward story, told quite simply." For my part I find it difficult not to regard this story as a mere wonder-tale deserving of the description "a luxury miracle," and quite out of keeping with the other miracles of Jesus and also with the implications of the temptation narratives, unless we are at liberty to regard it as an acted parable dealing with the nature of true purification.

More than once it seems to me that the theological-critical school of Gospel interpreters give a more intelligible exegesis of the narrative than is here offered by Headlam. Thus, where he asserts that "the evangelist omits as unimportant the story of Simon of Cyrene," I would say that the omission is due to his desire to stress that the work of the Passion, the cross-bearing and the suffering on the cross, is entirely the work of Jesus Himself.

Similarly in the anointing story of chapter twelve, where Headlam apparently regards the stories of Luke vii, Mark xiv, and John xii as varying accounts of the same historical incident, so that the reader has to choose solely on grounds of historical probability which of the varying conflicting details is correct, I would say that the Johannine story is due to the theological reflection of the evangelist upon the earlier Marcan and Lucan stories. He does not wish to suggest that the anointing by Mary is an act of coronation as the Marcan story implies. It is the *feet* and not the head of Jesus which she anoints. In the theological perspective of this evangelist, Jesus is crowned by God at His crucifixion. He reigns from the tree. The anointing by Mary, like all acts of Christian piety, is based on a recognition of the love of God revealed in the death of Jesus; but though it is an act of adoration so extravagant in its devotion that the house is filled with the odour of the ointment, it is nevertheless the adoration of one who approaches Jesus, as all believers must approach Him, in humility. Mary is thus a type of the true Christian worshipper, even as the sinful woman in Luke vii is a type of the true Christian penitent.

Or once again, when Headlam writes of the Marcan and Johannine narratives of the events leading up to the passion: "St Peter does not tell us about Lazarus because he was in Galilee when the event occurred. . . . The two accounts tell the story from different points of view and they supplement each other without discrepancy," he is not answering satisfactorily the trenchant criticism of this point of view put forward by Burkitt, and quoted on page 23: "If the events occurred as told in the Fourth Gospel, if they were as public as the Fourth Evangelist insists, so fraught with influence upon the actions of both friends and foes, they could not have been unknown to a well-informed personage like St Mark, nor could he have had any reason for suppressing a narrative at once so public and so edifying." On the other hand, we can well understand why the Fourth Evangelist, knowing a tradition about the raising of Lazarus, which he believed to be true, should have inserted it as a preface to his story of the passion. It was the claim of Jesus to bestow upon

men the gift of eternal life by raising them up from the death of sin, which led to the crucifixion: and this gift was the result of His crucifixion and resurrection. The evangelist therefore relates the story of the passion so that the raising of Lazarus is the event which leads the Jews to take final action against Jesus. He has probably misplaced it, just as he has misplaced, as Headlam is prepared to recognize, the story of Nicodemus.

The conclusions reached by Headlam in the chapter on the teaching of the Fourth Gospel should win wide assent. The teaching is given in the words of the evangelist, but contains reminiscences of actual sayings of Jesus. Though elaborated this teaching does not conflict with the teaching of the other Gospels; and though we cannot separate the words of Jesus from the explanations of the evangelist, we have grounds for supposing that even if he was not John the Apostle, he had very reliable information about the controversies in which Jesus was engaged with the Rabbis at Jerusalem.

The essay on St Mark's Gospel is a spirited attack upon *Formgeschichte*, which Headlam regarded as yet another wholly mistaken product of German criticism; and Professor R. H. Lightfoot's book, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, is severely censured. Headlam did not, I think, really understand this new approach to Gospel study. He seems to have regarded it as wholly negative, and failed to realize that it is not of necessity bound up with Wrede's theory of the Messianic secret, nor with the adverse historical judgments of some of its more extreme exponents. It would, I think, appear certain that, just as Harnack and Schweitzer have permanently influenced the critical study of the Gospels, though many of their conclusions have been rejected, so will it be with the Form-critics. They have at least made it abundantly clear that it was the gospel which created the Gospels.

Those who knew Headlam well, and all who are acquainted with his books, will, I think, agree that Agnes Headlam-Morley has given a remarkably fair and clear picture both of the man and of his thought. His impatience with humbug and sentimentality, and with everything that savoured of intellectual dishonesty or hypocrisy, made him a salutary though never very popular influence in the Anglican Church. "Headlam had little patience with those Anglicans who, while they profess to admire the devotion of the nonconformist communities, none the less assert that their sacraments are of no avail, their ministries invalid." He was a man of exceptional intellectual power and a very able man of affairs. He regarded it as his vocation to "use his gifts, and they were predominantly gifts of the intellect, to cut through the tangle of false learning and futile speculation." But his "naturally quick and even violent temper" and his arrogant attitude towards those who disagreed with him, rendered him a person to be respected rather than loved. It is good, however, to learn that as a Bishop "he learnt to endure with humorous resignation the misguided opinions of his opponents," and "that his best friends felt that at the end his patient pursuit of truth had been rewarded by a greater gentleness and a deeper understanding." The

closing paragraph of this memorable biographical essay is so good that I cannot refrain from quoting it in full:

"Of his private life there is little to tell. He married happily, and the death of his wife was the one great sorrow of his life. He loved children, but never had children of his own. To the young, it must be confessed, he appeared too formidable and too remote to arouse the spontaneous affection he would have cherished. He enjoyed society and was quite unconscious of his own oddities. He had great strength of mind and body. He lived his life outwardly and worked without interruption and without apparent effort. It would seem that he escaped the stress of inner conflict or deep personal emotion. Yet who are we to know the secrets of men's hearts? 'Autobiography,' he once said, 'what's the good of writing an autobiography? The really interesting things we think about ourselves are never written and never known.'"

R. V. G. Tasker.

Studies in Texts

Romans vii, 18 *f.*

"For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me, but to do that which is good is not. For the good which I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I practise" (R.V.).

A reader of the standard English commentaries is aware of a difference of opinion whether the apostle is speaking here of the regenerate or unregenerate self, but he could hardly catch more than an echo of a controversy where the protagonists abroad have been numerous; and Catholics[1] and Methodists,[2] Schweitzer[3] and the Liberals, are curious allies in a grand assault on a strategic position of the Reformed tradition.

The cumulative weight of this attack on the comparatively thin ranks of the latter school has been so far victorious over here that the confident assertion of Kirsopp Lake in 1910 that "the most primitive form of Christian doctrine held that Christians, as such, were free from sin"[4] seems nowadays to be commonly taught to theological students. Thus, in the well-known symposium *Essays on the Trinity and Incarnation*, the Bishop of Oxford accepts the *Religiongeschichte* theory at least to the extent that St Paul believed "in some of his moods" that Christians could not sin.[5] In this case the interpretation of Rom. vii, 18-19 must be that "what weighed upon Paul in his pre-Christian days was less the sense of guilt than the sense of powerlessness"; and that what he found in Christ was "less forgiveness than liberation."[6]

In Germany, where theologians have ever been polemical and sometimes acrimonious, this was of course part of the attempt to

[1] An English example is Charles Gore, *Epistle to the Romans*, I. 260 ff.
[2] N. Flew, *The Idea of Perfection*, 54.
[3] *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, 296.
[4] *The Expositor*, x, 63.
[5] *Op. cit.*, 230.
[6] So W. Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, 153.

relate primitive Christianity to other religions, by alleging that baptism was practised in order to change mysteriously the substance of the believer's soul. It was furthermore a handy tool in the challenge to the sin-consciousness of Lutheranism; and the most thorough investigation of all the N.T. evidence was made in this interest by Hans Windisch.[1] His thesis amounts to the theory that in the apostolic Church post-baptismal sin was equivalent to dechristianization. The essence of Paul's doctrine, Windisch said, is that we are without guilt because of faith in Christ and without sin because we are filled with the Holy Spirit. The agony of struggle which Paul had suffered as a Pharisee had been superseded by a life of obedience to the Lord's commands—commands which, as Windisch was to argue in a later treatise,[2] are both real and practicable.

Thus no room is allowed for the idea of progress in sanctity, and the N.T. evidence is assumed to prove that all the characteristics proper to a God-begotten man immediately reside in him in their fulness. Justification therefore means little more than the forgiveness of past sins when the convert begins his new life. The historical Jesus evokes our faith and obedience, but after this initial impetus, magnificent enough certainly, the enthusiastic Christian must earn the reward of eternal life by his own exertions. The manœuvres which Windisch is obliged to execute, however, in order to explain why every writing in the N.T., in fact, recognizes that Christians sin daily and yet remain Christians may be illustrated by his exegesis of Rom. xiii, 11-14: Paul has been suddenly gripped by missionary fervour, and in this moment of absent-minded zeal addresses the Roman Church as a body of lost souls needing to be snatched from their sinfulness, forgetting that they are Christians only requiring instruction! As a guide to the N.T. the Formula of Concord is more reliable: "This liberty of spirit in the elect children of God is not perfect, but is as yet weighed down with manifold infirmity."[3]

Orthodox Methodism, and other sects,[4] no less than Liberalism, teach that according to the N.T. God does something more with sin than forgive it, but "are not able to sin" becomes "need not sin." Here again Justification is no longer the doctrine that the Christian can trust in Christ in spite of his persisting sinfulness to the end of his days, and instead he has to be *worth* saving. The trouble with recent attempts to expound Perfection as the natural ascent for every true Christian is that they become involved in some unconvincing exegesis of 1 John; and when its apologists admit that one may lapse from the state of perfection, *i.e.*, have it one day and fall from it next, it is time to return to Luther's "Christianus non est in facto sed in fieri."

Catholicism offers at once an elaborate system of dealing with sin, not even ignoring the sins of the saints,[5] and also the ideal of a per-

[1] *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum bis Origines* (1908). Summarized by B. B. Warfield, *Studies in Perfectionism*, I, 239 ff.
[2] *Der Sinn der Bergpredigt;* 1st Ed., 1928.
[3] Schaff, *Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches*, 124.
[4] Troeltsch, *Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, 725.
[5] Cf. Bernard's *Twelve Degrees of Humility and Pride*.

fection attainable in this life, especially (or most easily) by those who observe the "counsels." As the Council of Trent insisted, when we are justified we are *made* righteous. The first step in this process is indeed taken by God, and to him man responds by adding virtue to virtue, thus using the capital furnished by God to produce meritorious fruit.[1] At the end of the process God justifies man for ever. Naturally, therefore, in Catholic tradition the commands of the Lord are indisputably practicable,[2] with the assistance of supernatural grace, and St Thomas cites Matt. v, 48 ("Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect"), to show that "the divine law does not prescribe the impossible";[3] and so Rom. vii, 18-19 refers to St Paul's pre-Christian experience of frustration.

The weakness of the Catholic position is that δικαιοῦν means almost "to save."[4] Dr E. L. Mascall is understandably sceptical of the value of discussing the meaning of the word in the Bible.[5] Similarly Dr C. H. Dodd ends the section on Righteousness in *The Bible and the Greeks* by suggesting that religious experience takes us further than mere semasiology by affirming that an unrighteous man is, by the grace of God, "made righteous."[6] For if it is the case that there is realized eschatology in the N.T. there will also be Perfectionism. (The Jews anticipated the abolition of sin in the Coming Age.)[7] (*Cf.* Dodd in his Moffatt commentary on Romans.)

Is it arguable then that the Reformed tradition is to be preferred? Now the N.T. yields, as Oscar Culman has been teaching,[8] a consistent theory neither of futurist nor yet of realized eschatology. Christians live in the interim between the partial, though real, manifestation of the Kingdom and its final consummation, *i.e.*, in the dispensation of the Reign of Christ, as distinct from the ultimate end of history when he will deliver the Kingdom to God the Father (1 Cor. xv, 24-28)—a distinction corresponding to that made by Jewish theology between the Messianic Age and the Age to Come.[9] It is then possible to do justice to the N.T. facts on the one hand of a real transformation which makes Christians sinless in principle, but also to the fact that this proper and ultimate nature of blamelessness will only be apparent "at His coming again," when at last sin will be wholly done away.

The verses under consideration are thus to be "understood of the struggles that are between grace and corruption in sanctified souls,"[10] for it was the Sermon on the Mount rather than the Mosaic Law that St Paul had in mind.[11]

St Augustine came round to this interpretation: "It had appeared

---

[1] F. Prat, S.J., *The Theology of St Paul*, II, 250.
[2] Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 272.
[3] *S.T.*, II; Q. ccxxxiv, Art. 2.
[4] N. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, 173.
[5] *Christ, the Christian, and the Church*, 82.
[6] *Op. cit.*, 59.
[7] References in Windisch, *Taufe und Sünde*.
[8] See *Journal of Theological Studies*, xlviii, 221.
[9] S. J. Case, *Studies in Early Christianity*, 317.
[10] John Evans, in Matthew Henry's Bible.
[11] Cf. Strack-Billerbeck's *Kommentar*, IV, 19 f.

to me also," he writes, "that the apostle was in this argument of his describing a man under the law. But afterwards I was constrained to give up the idea by those words where he says, 'Now then it is no more I that do it.' For to this belongs what he says subsequently also: 'There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.' And because I do not see how a man under the law should say, 'I delight in the law of God after the inward man'; since this very delight in good, by which, moreover, he does not consent to evil, not from fear of penalty, but from love of righteousness (for this is meant by 'delighting'), can only be attributed to grace."[1]

Dom Gregory Dix has lately drawn attention from the Catholic side to this fundamental question of Justification.[2] Its divergent interpretation leads some to a religion of works which Calvin called the doctrine that "the only benefit that proceeds from Christ is to open up a way for each to justify himself"[3] (but also to a life of sanctity), and others to a religion which Catholics stigmatize as being just Christian enough to make its professors miserable. And two practical conclusions follow from all this:

(1) It is surprising that those who incline to the moderate Calvinism of the Thirty-Nine Articles are generally to be found eagerly co-operating in local ventures with Perfectionist sects which are really, for all their indifference to episcopal government, in the main stream of the Catholic tradition.

(2) Anglicans of the Reformed tradition can avail themselves more easily perhaps than Anglo-Catholics of the biblical eschatology and doctrine of Justification, which together impart an urgent soteriological relevance to the ethical teaching of Christ. The Catholic doctrine of the Imago, on the other hand, means that His teaching merely supplements and never contradicts natural ethics; and the identification of Kingdom and Church turns the Sermon on the Mount into the new Law for Christians; and the Tridentine doctrine of Justification implies that this law (contrary, as we have argued, to the experience of St Paul), is practicable, *i.e.*, that the Sermon on the Mount is a piece of refined Wisdom literature. While, therefore, we need not raise our eyebrows because Catholic works on moral theology do not resort to the complications of the Palestinian appendix to the Nicomachean Ethics, the publication of *semi-official* reports on ethical problems which do not discuss the relevance of the teaching of our Lord is a scandal which Reformed theologians must lament.

WILFRID BROWNING.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Addison is Vicar of Britford, Salisbury.

Dr Cross is Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford and Associate Editor of the forthcoming Lexicon of Patristic Greek.

---

[1] *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*, I, 22.
[2] *The Apostolic Ministry*, 301.
[3] *Institutes*, III, ch. xv, 6.

The Rev. R. V. G. Tasker, B.D., is Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of London.

The Rev. Wilfrid Browning, B.D., is Priest-in-charge of St Richard's, Hove.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MINISTRY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The word validity has been used again in recent discussions concerning the Ministry, and in particular Prof. Ramsey's employment of the term in his essay entitled "Evangelicals and the Ministry" which appeared in the October issue of THEOLOGY, calls for a further examination of the meaning that it ought to have in respect to ministerial orders. Prof. Ramsey refers to Dr Kirk's treatment of the subject in *The Apostolic Ministry*, and points out in this connexion that the appeal to scripture and antiquity is one of the primary lessons to be learnt from the Anglican formularies. The purpose of this letter is to suggest that if we bring the concept of validity to this bar, we find that antiquity speaks with a not very certain voice and scripture has some very disconcerting things to say.

The article by Dr Robinson, entitled "Hosea and the Virgin Birth," which immediately followed Prof. Ramsey's, treats of the Mystery from which all "valid" orders claim to derive their authority. The writer's very suggestive approach may therefore provide a suitable starting point for our inquiry. He sees in Hosea's tragic marriage "the typical action-pattern of the genuine divine *agape* deliberately choosing to work through a reversal of all human judgment to reveal the more unequivocally the quality and greatness of its power." Hosea's experience is a foreshadowing of the Incarnation in which God's action in coming to birth outside the bond of lawful marriage "authenticates itself as genuine precisely in the offence of human and legal righteousness."

It seems legitimate to advance from Dr Robinson's exegesis and trace this same action-pattern throughout our Lord's life and in the scriptural revelation as a whole. His signs of the Kingdom must have been regarded by His more supercilious contemporaries as the activities of a typical miracle-monger—"Nay, but he deceiveth the people" —and modern scholars have classified them as the *novellen* of a marvel-loving peasantry. Concerning the supreme miracle of the Resurrection, upon which the New Testament faith is based, the criticism of Celsus and modern doubters may be perverse in face of the strength of the evidence; but none the less, the Church has to proclaim that faith in face of the scandal of a disappearing corpse and the strange visions of frightened women and Galilean fishermen. The Church asserts with conviction that Baptism and the Eucharist have dominical authority, and yet the controversy still continues as

to whether our Lord actually commanded either to be done in His name.

When we turn to the history of the New Testament Church, again the divine *agape* reveals itself in the uncertain, the unexpected, and the offensive. Of the chosen Twelve nearly all remain historical nonentities, and the inauguration of the Gentile Mission was entrusted to one whose apostolic commission was open to the charge of subjectivity, and who had to defend it against those who claimed for other apostles a superior authority. This Gentile Mission, the wild olive, grafted contrary to all horticultural principles into the stock of Israel, was destined to dwarf the church of Israelite descent into insignificance.

It is a scandal to the simple believer when he is told that the Canon of Scripture itself, which the Church was guided by the Holy Spirit to form as a safeguard of the apostolic teaching, contains possibly more interpolations and pseudepigraphic works than any other body of ancient literature. To take the New Testament alone, none of the four Gospels are of undisputed apostolic authorship, and the Pastoral Epistles, which are in many respects crucial for our knowledge of the first century ministry, would seem to be described exactly by Dr Kirk's definition of invalidity as "having a claim which is not without a considerable degree of verisimilitude, even though it cannot in the end be made good."[1]

It may prove to be the right interpretation of the references in these epistles to the *episcopas* to say that they imply non-episcopacy, which was therefore generally prevalent in the Church of the first century, though not necessarily with the same function and authority as that of the later bishop; but scholars of the non-episcopal churches have for centuries thought otherwise, and it is a matter of exegetical niceties to prove them wrong—if indeed they have been proved wrong. The further contention that the apostolic commission was passed on by enactment of the apostles to these same bishops seems to rest partly on a possibly right, but nevertheless highly disputable, translation of the words *ton leitourgian auton* and *heteron ellogimon andron* in 1 Clement 44 (ii) and (iii).[2]

These examples—and many more could be adduced—are by no means intended to suggest that we can have no certainty with regard to the Christian faith and the sacrament and ministry which declare it, nor to impugn their God-given character; but rather to demonstrate that again and again the form of God's revelational activity seems deliberately calculated to undermine the certainties and concepts of validity on which humanity normally relies in order to establish a divine validity. This conclusion seems to be consonant with the ambivalent or dialectical attitude of scripture to individuals divinely called and institutions divinely appointed. The king of Israel is both the Lord's Anointed and the symbol of Israel's apostasy. The priesthood and the sacrificial system are God-given: but the prophets can still say in the name of the Lord, "I hate and

[1] *Apostolic Ministry*, p. 36.

[2] Dix in *Apostolic Ministry*, pp. 256 ff.

despise your feasts." "The law is holy and the commandment holy, and righteous and good"; but it is at the same time the very occasion for man's sin. Peter is both the Rock and Satan; the first to preach to the Gentiles who yet had to be withstood to the face because he stood condemned for having withdrawn from table intercourse with Gentiles. The successors of the Maccabean martyrs are the Pharisees, whose very piety receives our Lord's condemnation.

The question of the validity of ministries needs to be examined against this background. Those who speak of "invalid" ministries must remember that they acquired their "invalidity" in prophetic protest against the very unapostolic character of the validly ordained medieval prince bishops in the case of the Reformers and of the eighteenth-century Anglican bishops in the case of the Methodists. "Let them glory in their weaknesses that the power of Christ may rest upon them." And let the episcopalians of the episcopalians say with St Paul, "What things were gain to me, these have I counted loss for Christ." Episcopalians and many members of non-episcopal churches believe that episcopacy, whether its lineal descent can be traced with certainty to the Apostles or not, is destined to be the God-given means of restoring the unity of the Church, as well as the symbol and safeguard of that unity—both age-long and world-wide —when it is achieved. But from within that unity the Protestant criticism of episcopacy will be vitally necessary, if it is to be saved as an institution from the degeneracy which has marked its history periodically in the past. Scripture would seem to indicate that Protestantism and Catholicism, so far from being incompatibles, are contrasting, and at the same time complementary, aspects of the divine dialectic within the Church. Either side needs the criticism of the other. The Anglican who remembers the unsavoury origins of the reformed Church of England in the reign of Henry VIII can never boast of his heritage, though he may be thankful for what was mercifully preserved to him through those tumultuous times. For all alike 1 Cor. i, 27 might well be translated, "God chose the invalid things of this world that he might put to shame the things that are valid."

T. S. Garrett.

Tirumaraiyur, S. India.

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Professor Ramsey, in his valuable article in your October number, writes: "Our duty seems primarily not to construct a doctrine from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century opinions and precedents, but to ask what was in antiquity the meaning of the bishop's commission in relation to the Church as catholic and apostolic." While fully endorsing this argument, I should like to be allowed to comment on the use now being made of the writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. I have in mind particularly Dr Sykes's Theology Occasional Paper, *The Church of England and non-*

episcopal churches in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Canon Greenslade's review of that pamphlet in the current number of the *Journal of Theological Studies*, and the Bishop of Chichester's book *Christian Unity*. Dr Sykes confines himself in the main to what he considers to be a statement of historical fact, while the other two writers draw what they think to be the practical conclusions which follow from that statement. At first sight it seems odd that Dr Sykes should think it worth while to present evidence to show that many of the most prominent Anglican divines in the seventeenth century did not hold an "exclusive" view of episcopacy, and were prepared on occasion to communicate in foreign non-episcopal churches. I say odd because there has been in existence since 1914 a standard work on this subject which contains much of what is to be found in Dr Sykes's pamphlet—namely, A. J. Mason's *The Church of England and Episcopacy*. On looking closer, however, one sees that Dr Sykes's purpose is to argue that there is something which he calls "the Anglican tradition" in this matter, and that this "Anglican tradition" was set aside by the Oxford Movement. The implication is drawn by Canon Greenslade and the Bishop that it ought to be restored. It becomes apparent that this "Anglican tradition" is only established by brushing aside all other seventeenth century Anglican views as extreme and unrepresentative. But among those who appear to have held an "exclusive" view is one name of very great authority in Anglican theology, that of Pearson, author of the famous book on the Creed. Further, what are we to make of the fate of the various comprehensive proposals of the latter part of the seventeenth century if *the* Anglican tradition was such as Dr Sykes claims? The position of ministers of foreign churches who wished to hold preferment in England was involved in the scheme of 1689, and the clearly hostile attitude of the Lower House prevented the proposed concessions from being brought before Convocation. Why should the views of certain of the bishops be taken as representing *the* Anglican tradition rather than those of the lower clergy?

I turn now to consider Dr Sykes's treatment of the Oxford Movement. Here again Mason supports him, but again with qualifications which are important. Mason says (italics mine): "There was nothing new in the tractarian insistence upon the apostolical succession. What was *to a certain extent* new was on the one hand the rigid aloofness with which the tractarians regarded the foreign churches which were without it, and on the other hand the passionate scorn with which the doctrine was repudiated by partisans of the opposing school. Of these two novelties the second, if the expression may be allowed, was the newer" (*op. cit.*, p. 449). And again: "That there was much that was irritating and one-sided in the writings of some of the tractarians is true; but the new attitude which they took up towards foreign protestantism in general was not altogether unjustified. Earlier English theologians had almost always based their defence of foreign orders upon two grounds. One was the ground of necessity. . . . The other was that the foreign reformers stood . . . for what was catholic and primitive, as against the modern corrup-

tions of Rome. Both grounds began to fail under the defenders' feet. The misgivings of the Laudian and Restoration writers with regard to the plea of necessity proved to be only too well founded. History made it clear that many of the foreign reformers, particularly the Scottish, broke with episcopacy on purpose. And the process of doctrinal disintegration had begun to set in" (*ibid.*, p. 450).

In spite of the dictum of Dr Darwell Stone, so triumphantly quoted by both Dr Sykes and the Bishop of Chichester, I would suggest that some at least of the Tractarians were well aware that they could not find entire support for an "exclusive" position in the Elizabethan and Caroline divines. The inclusion of an extract from Bramhall in Tract 74 seems to be evidence of this, as are also such remarks as these of R. I. Wilberforce: "When these [*sc.* Hooker and Waterland], therefore, or other modern writers, are quoted in the present work, the author does not intend to assert that he agrees with them entirely: his agreement with them is limited by their agreement with the Primitive Church" (*Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, 3rd edition, p. 37, n. 19); "If there should be any point, therefore of vital importance . . . anything affecting the foundation of her faith or practice, in which our Church has departed from the maxims of Antiquity, her own principles demand that it should be examined and amended" (*ibid.*, p. 369). And with explicit reference to Cosin's attitude to the sacraments of foreign Protestants, Wilberforce writes: "In those days men were not prepared to draw such conclusions respecting the necessity of adhering at all hazards to the principles of the ancient Church, as the course of events, and the progress of infidel opinions, have since forced upon all Catholic Christians" (*ibid.*, p. 16). And so we conclude by returning to Professor Ramsey's point.

I am, Sir,
Yours obediently,
ERIC KEMP.

EXETER COLLEGE,
OXFORD.
November 9th, 1948.

THE BURIAL SERVICE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I do not think your reviewer of Dr R. J. Campbell's book, *The Life of the World to Come*, is altogether correct in ascribing the fact that 1 Cor. 15 is not always to be heard at funeral services to an attenuated Platonism, or to a notion that there is a greater consolation in the meretricious. I think it is more often due to the fact that a single-handed clergyman in an urban parish has not the physical or the spiritual energy to repeat that chapter several times a week, and sometimes two or three times on an afternoon. Personally I find funerals most exhausting, and I must confess that I have fallen back on 2 Cor. 4, and even on 1 Thess. 4. There is also the question of how best to apportion one's time, and the quick need our ministrations

more than do the dead. I sometimes think that "indiscriminate burial" needs enquiring into almost as much as "indiscriminate Baptism."

Yours faithfully,
AUSTIN LEE.

ST STEPHEN'S VICARAGE,
PARKSIDE ROAD,
HOUNSLOW.
MIDDLESEX.

The reviewer writes: "What is apt to be heard at funerals at which 1 Cor. 15 is not read is apt to be neither 2 Cor. 4 nor 1 Thess. 4 but Rev. 7 or 21. Do not the quick also receive some measure of our ministrations at funerals?"

BOOK REVIEWS

PAUL AND RABBINIC JUDAISM. Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology. By W. D. Davies. S.P.C.K. 27s. 6d.

Mr Davies has written a really valuable book in which he has brought to bear a very wide knowledge of rabbinical literature on various aspects of Paulinism, such as "The old and the new Humanity—the first and the second Adam"; "The old and the new man"; "The old and the new Torah—Christ as the Wisdom of God." He supports his arguments with copious extracts, and in an appendix prints the text of the less accessible references. His style is clear and the book very readable—no small achievement in dealing with Jewish rabbinical literature. Moreover, his references are always relevant to the point he is discussing, in spite of the habitual tendency of the rabbis to go off into irrelevancies on the smallest possible excuse, or on none at all. He has read widely in the vast modern literature on the subject. Altogether this is a book which no student of Pauline theology can afford to ignore.

I trust that Mr Davies, who has done me the honour of quoting my works with considerable frequency, and usually with approval, will not think me guilty of gross ingratitude if I devote the greater part of this review to the points on which I disagree with him; my motive in doing so is the hope that it may help him to give us something even better next time. It is very hard for any scholar to be at home equally in the ancient literature of Hellenism and Judaism, and I cannot help feeling that on the Greek side he fails to attain to a standard worthy of his work on the Jewish.

To begin with lexical matters. He writes (p. 18), "The term *σὰρξ* was not used in the prevailing Hellenistic literature to express the material as opposed to the ideal. We find *ὕλη* opposed to *νοῦς* but never *σάρξ*. Liddell and Scott can give no instance of *σὰρξ* being so used." He notes that they give one reference to Plutarch (they also give one to Epicurus, which I have not verified). It is very unsafe to use the *argumentum e silentio* in dealing with the references of a classical lexicon to the literature of Hellenistic Judaism. A glance

at Leisegang's index to the Cohn-Wendland Philo will give him plenty of instances of the use of *νοῦς* as opposed to *σάρξ* and a treatment of the flesh as evil or the source of evil. Naturally it was not intrinsically evil in so far as it was created by God; but the fall of Adam would account for its being evil now. It is always wise to consult Leisegang in addition to Liddell and Scott.

Again he objects to my view that in 2 Cor. v. 1 the term *σκῆνος* betrays the influence of Hellenistic belief. He writes (p. 313): "We accept the suggestion made by T. W. Manson . . . that Paul's thought is here influenced by the Feast of Tabernacles. The term *σκῆνος* is used in the LXX to translate the Hebrew *sukkah*. Thus the LXX renders Lev. xxiii, 42 thus *ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσετε*." Now T. W. Manson's suggestion is no more than a suggestion, and it suffers from the disadvantage that the LXX, following normal Greek usage, never uses *σκῆνος* (from which you cannot get *σκηναῖς*) to mean a tent, booth, or tabernacle, but always *σκήνη*. The N.T. follows suit; *σκῆνος* only appears in this passage, while *σκήνη* in the literal sense is fairly common. Liddell and Scott give one reference to a dubious inscription where *σκηνος* = tent, but otherwise only recognize its metaphorical use of the body as the tabernacle of the soul (or the curious literal use of it = corpse, apparently derived from the metaphor). I cannot help feeling that St Paul would have learnt to use the right word for a tent in the Aquila menage.

It is more important that while he recognizes the danger of trying to draw too clear-cut a distinction between "Hellenistic" and "Palestinian" Judaism he is content to assume that, if a concept can be paralleled in rabbinical literature, we are justified in assuming that St Paul drew it from his rabbinical learning. Now the amount of rabbinical literature that is pre-Pauline is very small: the apocalyptic literature is sometimes older, but it demands a great deal of caution, and Mr Davies seems to me to invoke 1 Enoch to an extent which is quite unjustifiable in view of the suspicion that the non-Greek parts may be post-Christian. He tries to maintain that the figure of the cosmic Wisdom of Proverbs supplied a real need in Judaism, since the introduction of angels and personifications bridged the gulf with a God whose majesty made Him inaccessible. Frankly I do not believe it for a moment. For rabbinical literature in general God is at once the exalted ruler of the universe, and for Philo he is is *ὁ ὤν*, or for Josephus *τὸ Θεῖον*. But for all of them alike, when they come out of their more speculative moods, he is the anthropomorphic God of the O.T., who never fails to preserve His close and loving interest in His chosen people, except in so far as they sin against Him. The personification of Wisdom cannot be explained on these lines, while its identification with the Torah seems to be not a natural evolution of Jewish thought, but a desperate attempt to get rid of the highly awkward figure. Ben Sirach's statement that "all these things are the book of the Covenant" (Ecclus. xxiv, 23) strikes me not as "a commonplace in his time," but a later interpolation into a dangerous passage, while he ought not to quote Baruch iv, 1 without noting that it is under suspicion as a Christian interpolation.

Similarly the rabbinical explanation of the "beginning" of Gen. i. 1 of the Torah as the divine plan of the universe on the analogy of a human king is highly significant. For it is an adaptation of Philo *De Op. Mund.* 17, which itself is an adaptation of the Timæus (28 A), probably through the medium of a commentary. Naturally I am not concerned to deny that St Paul may have learnt of the cosmic wisdom and its equation with the Torah in the rabbinical schools of Jerusalem. But it must be remembered that his rabbinical parallels from Bereschith Rabbah are all later than the attempt of the Church (going back to Aristo of Pella) to maintain that the true reading of Gen. i. 1 is *ἐν νίῳ ἐποίησεν*. In any case rabbinical Judaism in the first century seems to have been far more open to Greek influences than it was after the fall of Jerusalem, and that Hellenistic Judaism was still more open to such influences. Consequently we must allow for a considerable Greek element in his rabbinical upbringing and a considerable willingness to accept Greek ideas in his contact with the Gentile world, such as we should expect from a man who can, at least in his later letters, write quite good rhetorical Greek prose.

Again Mr Davies seems to me not nearly wary enough in his dealings with Greek philosophy of the Hellenistic age. Thus (p. 182, n. 6): "In 1 Cor. ii. 16 Paul apparently equates *πνεῦμα* and *νοῦς*. This implies, if we are to think of Paul as a metaphysician, that he cannot have accepted a Stoic metaphysic. . . . To confuse *πνεῦμα* and *νοῦς* for a Stoic is an inconsistency." But a glance at Diog. Laert. vii, 7. 143 shows that the divine element which pervades all things, including "inanimate" objects, had already been described as *νοῦς* by Posidonius. (For Chrysippus' use of *πνεῦμα* in this sense *cf.* Sext. Emp. ix. 130. v. Arh. iii. 90, no. 370.) There is no more dangerous error than to suppose that the Stoics were "materialists" in any modern sense. This is not a mere point of detail as regards Hellenistic philosophy; Mr Davies's failure to recognize the fluidity of Hellenistic thought and language, and his determination to find all St Paul in rabbinical Judaism as revolutionized by his acceptance of Christ, leads him to underrate the extent to which his conception of the Holy Spirit has been modified by Hellenistic influences. The conception of some of the rabbis of the Jewish conception of the Holy Spirit may of course have been modified by the same influences before his time—or they may not.

I hope it will not seem ungracious on my part to point out what seem to me to be serious defects (and I have noted many others) in a book for which I have the utmost admiration and from which I have learned much. I am only anxious that Mr Davies should not allow himself to be led by an incautious enthusiasm for discovering points of contact between St Paul and the rabbis into thinking that you can explain the whole of Paulinism either from Jewish or from Greek sources. Quite apart from the intensity of his own experience of redemption and of being "in Christ" (which I am sure is a primary datum, not to be explained by any Pauline language about the new Exodus or the corporate solidarity of the Jewish nation and the Church), we have to allow for the peculiar *tertium quid* of Hellen-

istic Judaism, which can vary from the almost purely Palestinian outlook of the Gospels to the "philosophy" of the Philonic corpus. To disentangle the various strands is always difficult, and there is always a wide margin for disagreement. But to ride one particular element to death at the expense of others is only to darken counsel. The effect of this book will be to enlighten it, but there are moments at which it threatens to darken it already. *Non uno itinere potest pervenire ad tam grande secretum.*

WILFRED L. KNOX.

PEMBROKE COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

PASCAL AND KIERKEGAARD: A STUDY IN THE STRATEGY OF EVANGELISM (2 vols.). By Denzil G. M. Patrick. Lutterworth Press. Vol. I 15s., Vol. II 25s.

The introductory testimony to Patrick's qualities as a critical thinker, a brilliant linguist, a man of sympathy and wide experience, all tempered with Christian devotion, does not leave us disappointed with the work that follows. The author, however, did not live to see his masterpiece published: the final chapters were written "when the hand of the great Summoner was already upon him." He thus followed the steps of Pascal himself, of Kierkegaard, and of Dorothy Eastwood (author of *The Revival of Pascal*). It is remarkable that these four writers, with such kinship in the realms of the intellect and the spirit, with their tasks hardly completed and some of their writings posthumously published, should have been unable to complete half the normal span of life.

Noting the affinity between Pascal and Kierkegaard is by no means an original contribution on the part of Patrick, for their resemblance has attracted attention since the publication of Pascal's *Œuvres* by Brunschvicg in 1906. Patrick's peculiar contribution to this comparison is the study of their unanimity in the "strategy of evangelism." His thesis is that these two advocated an essentially Christian type of thought, undiluted by the influences of Greek, rationalist, immanentist, and monistic philosophies. Till recently the specific nature of this type of thought has received scant attention because of the might of the Renaissance flood, swollen by the streams of Cartesianism and Hegelianism. But Pascal and Kierkegaard stood firm against this flood. Neither underestimated the value of reason and logic, but neither claimed to present the Christian message in wholly rational or intelligible terms. Mediate, demonstrable knowledge leaves no room not only for human freedom, but for the miraculous in religion, for the transcendence and initiative of God. (God is as free to act as man!) Christian apologetic or evangelism is not a defence but an offence. It leads man through a knowledge of self to a knowledge of God, and few want to know themselves. Grant reason its place, certainly, but becoming a Christian is more a matter of obeying than of understanding.

There are three main parts to Patrick's work. Part I, the whole of the former volume, is an outline of seventeenth-century thought, a

biography of Pascal, and an exposition of his religious ideas with lengthy quotations from the *Lettres Provinciales* and the *Pensées*, interspersed with helpful explanations and criticisms. The *Pensées*, scattered fragments of notes found after Pascal's death, have been published in countless forms in French, according to their subject matter, *e.g.*, Brunschvicg's classic edition, or following Pascal's own plan for a proposed apology, *e.g.*, Stewart's recent arrangement based on Filleau de la Chaise's report. Patrick adheres more closely to Pascal's design, and thus widens the approach of English readers, whose acquaintance with Pascal has been confined to a translation of Brunschvicg's edition in the Everyman's series.

The field of Volume I is too extensive to allow a detailed survey of Patrick's treatment of Pascal's life and thought, but tribute must be paid to the fairness of his handling of such highly controversial subjects as Pascal's Jansenism, his motives for writing the *Provinciales*, and his dying convictions. Pascal was indeed too great a soul to be tied down to the beliefs of any particular "ism"; his faith was at once too simple and too profound for that. The author does well to warn us against an anti-intellectualist interpretation of the "heart," the chief organ of faith according to Pascal.

Part II deals with Kierkegaard in the same way, and occupies over three-quarters of the second volume. The account of the nineteenth-century background—religious, philosophical, and political—is an essential preliminary to the understanding of Kierkegaard himself. In spite of Lowrie's massive work, the biography, with the familiar landmarks of Kierkegaard's relationship with his father, his break with Regine (Regina?), and his violent assault on orthodoxy, is not redundant, for all these events are closely linked up with Kierkegaard's inward, spiritual struggle. Extracts from his writings, again varied by explanation and criticism, give a balanced impression of Kierkegaard's thought, and would be particularly welcome to the student who has not the time, or perhaps the courage, to read these extensive writings themselves.

The way to the comparison of Pascal and Kierkegaard may seem to have been too long, but Part III would otherwise have to presume too much on the part of the reader. Yet the way has been so long that the author has to resort to much repetition to refresh our minds. The short epilogue that follows is highly practical in its nature, and relevant to the modern religious situation. Patrick succeeds in presenting Pascal and Kierkegaard as kindred spirits, whose methods of evangelism, the universal Church, and the individual Christian of today neglect at their own peril.

Misprints are few. In Volume I, Verbier for Vergier (p. 27 bottom line); furthe for further (p. 111, l. 3); §949 and §941—there are only 924 fragments in the edition Patrick uses (p. 208, notes 2 and 3). In Volume II, indirec tndication for indirect indication (p. 138, l. 37); and Matt. xxvi, 6 for Matt. xxv, 6 (p. 147, line 39).

J. C. Mears.

Mostyn.

THE THEOLOGY OF P. T. FORSYTH. By Gwilym O. Griffith. Lutterworth Press. 6s.

The name of Peter Taylor Forsyth is rivalling that of Soren Kierkegaard in providing for our generation the thrill of a major rediscovery of theological genius. The rediscovery of Forsyth has not, of course, been so long delayed as was that of his Danish predecessor, but was comparably complete. This reviewer can offer testimony of the latter fact. By chance, some fifteen years ago, I encountered, in looking over a legacy library, Forsyth's *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*. The reading of that one volume marked a revolution in my understanding of the New Testament, analogous to what the discovery of Barth's *Epistle to the Romans* must have meant to many others in those same years. A search for other Forsyth books began. But all the libraries of this capital city of the United States, some of them supposedly omniscient, have thus far yielded only a truncated shelf of Forsyth's writings. Their present reprinting ought to be a boon to our generation.

The little volume by Mr Griffith ought to serve a most worthy purpose. It is modest in scope, and invites to the reading of Forsyth himself. But it serves excellently both as a summary of Forsyth's thought for those who already know him and welcome recollection, and as an introduction to his wisdom for those who wish to make the acquaintance of this, quite possibly the greatest theologian of the past fifty years in the English-speaking world. Mr Griffith discusses Forsyth's theology under well chosen, typically Forsythean, categories—Authority, Christology, The Holy, Æsthetics, Churchmanship. The volume, to be sure, is for the theologically informed, and assumes acquaintance with the history of theological thought from Schleiermacher to Harnack, and even Barth. Nor does the author inject his own critical evaluations of Forsyth except in a few asides. The purpose of the book is not juridic, but maieutic (a favourite word, by the way, with Forsyth himself). The theology of Forsyth is sufficiently rich to warrant a volume devoted simply to expository guidance.

Forsyth was one of the forerunners of the theological revolution of the past generation. He has been called a Barthian before Barth. The comparison is not unworthy of Forsyth. Forsyth may, as a matter of fact, prove to be the more useful for our generation, at least in America and England. He is more sensitive than Barth to the need for apologetics and for a theology of cultural mediation as supplementary to a theology of proclamation.

Whatever else characterizes our newer theological scene—be it called neo-orthodoxy, the new evangelicalism, *le renouveau biblique*, or neo-Reformation theology—it is marked by a rediscovery of biblical categories. In such a return to *the* Gospel (as distinguished even from "the Gospels"), Forsyth was ruthless in cutting away the theological underbrush of centuries. Nothing stood in his way—not Protestant orthodoxy, or Catholic sacramentalism, or even the sacred creedal deposit (sacred to Forsyth also) of Nicæa and Chalcedon. Back he goes to the faith of the apostles. The clarity with which he

revealed the contrast between the Christ of apostolic faith and the unbiblical "historical Jesus" of Liberalism is still breathtaking. "For positive theology, Christ is the object of faith; for liberal theology, He is its first and greatest subject. It is really an infinite difference" (Griffith, p. 97). He could summarize the theological significance of Formgeschichte in a sentence: "The epistles are more inspired than the Gospels" (*Theology in Church and State*). Possibly no more trenchant criticism of Catholicism—particularly of its substance-theology—has been written in our time than is contained in *The Church and the Sacraments*; yet Forsyth was a high churchman —very high indeed. Anglo-Catholics could still find in Forsyth's plea for a rediscovery of the sacraments and of the priestly character of the Church an arsenal of weapons against subjective evangelicalism. Yet Forsyth himself is uncompromisingly an evangelical, in the apostolic sense of the word. He forces us all back to the New Testament doctrine of grace as, first of all, a moral, not metaphysical, fact (Griffith, p. 36 *ff.*).

Mr Griffith's book, one may hope, will be widely read. It is not the last that should be written about Peter Taylor Forsyth. "There were giants in those days."

Theodore O. Wedel.

The College of Preachers,
Washington Cathedral.

About William Law. A Running Commentary on his Works. By Arthur W. Hopkinson. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

The times are ripe for a book about William Law; and this is a good book. It is timely if only because, as its author says: "His clear insight into human character and motive, combined with his steadfast courage in proclaiming the principles of conduct, make him a tonic, however astringent, for a sick world. Never was the need greater." It was never greater because not only is civilization collapsing, but human beings are losing all recognition of a distinction between right and wrong. Mr Hopkinson has studied the works of William Law intensively—nine close-packed volumes; and he has condensed the result into 130 pages of informative matter, seasoned with wit and wise discernment, and attractively presented. He is appreciative and he is critical, but he is never either fulsome or unfair. He treats of his subject in five aspects: as man, controversialist, moralist, mystic, theologian. In the first section, the effects of circumstance on character are examined shrewdly, and if here and there he seems to damn his subject with faint praise, chiefly on the score of his having been "the victim of adulation in his life-time," this in no wise detracts from the final verdict: "He died with the seal of his mental and moral integrity unbroken, a saint of God." His merit as a controversialist is that he met his opponents fairly and squarely on their own ground: "He neither shirked difficulties nor misinterpreted what his adversary had to say, even when it was said badly." How salutary in an age which prefers victory in argument to reverence for truth! His controversies with Hoadly, War-

burton, Trapp, de Mandeville, Tindal, and the Deists are interestingly discussed in this section, but the most important, that with John Wesley, is left to the last. Law's highest achievement, however, as is rightly pointed out, was not as a controversialist, but as a teacher. Mr Hopkinson begins the third section with some observations upon the nature of morality, affirming that it owes its dynamic to belief. Perhaps he is not quite sufficiently explicit about the nature of belief, which may be either theoretical or practical; however, he leaves us in no doubt that Law's belief was of the latter kind. He is "the greatest writer on morality that England has produced," and he was a perfectionist if ever there was one. His moral judgments were by no means infallible, but "his writings rank among the lasting books of the world, because they are concerned with the principles which solve all problems, rather than with the attempt to find some temporary way of by-passing particular moral puzzles." That is to say, if I mistake not, Law was neither a casuist nor the propounder of any "type of ethical theory." He was a prophet who saw life in terms of Either/Or: right or wrong, true or false, good or evil. In the section on mysticism Mr Hopkinson makes clear the distinction between the genuine mystic and the student of mysticism, and says of Law that when he was furthest from Behmen he was himself most a mystic. This is, of course, a suggestion that Law himself would have hotly denied; but there is truth in it, inasmuch that his mysticism was integral to himself, and not derived. The last section, which will be of most interest to readers of THEOLOGY, is perhaps the best. Lastly, a word about Law's literary style, which ranks high among the treasures of the English language. Mr Hopkinson well says: "His style suggests the incoming tide, wave after wave repeating itself; but the tide as a whole making its steady advance."

GEORGE SEAVER.

ST CANICE'S LIBRARY,
KILKENNY.

THE ENGLISHMAN'S RELIGION. Edited by Ashley Sampson. George Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

This is a pleasant book, as all who have known its compiler will expect. To THEOLOGY it is the last work of a friend. Both the pages and the advisory committee of this journal have benefited from his literary criticism. But the present anthology sets out to be more than pleasant and more than literary. It has an historical thesis to maintain—that there is a discernible strand of emphasis running through a thousand years of English religion. Beowulf and a twentieth-century airman are akin, and there is a family tree which can be written in between them. The opposite view has been put with arresting exaggeration by Canon Smyth. "The English character as we know it," he has said, "is the work of two men: Archbishop Tillotson and the Duke of Wellington." Strangely enough Mr Sampson's anthology contains no passage from the former's sermons. The

Duke is represented by a letter, redolent of the regular army, about the provision of chaplains.

The vaunted enigma of our national character is a fashionable subject of comment and debate. This book provides the champions of continuity with an impressive armoury. Here is Chaucer's village parson, the very type for which any present-day Parochial Church Council that knew its own mind would indent to the patron. But Chaucer is apt to be almost incredibly of today. Shakespeare's Henry V and Drake before Cadiz, for all the attempts to revive the spirit of their godly buccaneering during the recent war, are dated Elizabeth, though it seems still to be hoped to transfer such heroics from pillage to production. As for the most profound piece in the whole book, Herrick's *No Coming to God without Christ*, could anything be less typical of us? Yet it is good to be reminded that there have been Englishmen who could write in that strain, before we are lost in the sublime absurdity of Blake's *Jerusalem*, removed from its context.

But this is hardly a representative collection. There are features of English religion which find no place in it, and among them at least one of the most perennial. For here there is hardly a trace of our peculiarly English species of anti-clericalism, so different from the dour anti-clericalism that delivers ethical orations at gravesides in Continental cemeteries and yet so definite. It has driven out one monarch and many incumbents. Macaulay liked it and might have been called into service.

No anthology will satisfy any of its readers, yet there is no lover of things English who will not be pleased by this one. It is all the better because its compiler was not afraid to include what is well known. The next decade may disclose whether it records what we are or only something that we have been for a while.

FRANK BENNETT.

WIGAN.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE SCOTTISH JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY. September, 1948. Oliver and Boyd. 3s. 6d.

This number contains three articles, entitled "Concerning the Ministry," by Professor J. H. S. Burleigh, Dr T. F. Torrance, and Dr F. W. Camfield. They all deal with questions raised by *The Apostolic Ministry*. Dr Torrance's contribution is a striking piece of theological polemics. He traces what he regards as the error in *The Apostolic Ministry* to a concealed christological heresy and to neglect of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

A DICTIONARY OF ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY. Edited by S. L. Ollard, Gordon Crosse, and M. F. Bond. Mowbray. 25s.

This is a third and revised edition of a well-known work of reference, and it will be welcome to students. In the revision, account

has been taken of the results of recent research. Articles have been added on some eminent churchmen who have died since the last edition (1919) as well as on other subjects which were not formerly included. This edition is better printed than the last, but the maps which were previously supplied have been omitted, although no mention seems to be made of this fact. A. R. V.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

AKADEMIE VELEHRADSKÁ: *Miscellanea in honorem Francisci Xav. Grivec* (n.p.).

ALL SAINTS' RECTORY (GLASGOW, W. 3): Denis Clements, *In Remembrance of His Death and Passion: A Drama of the Eucharist* (1s.).

ALLEN AND UNWIN: John Laird, *On Human Freedom* (7s. 6d.).

GEOFFREY BLES: Jacques Maritain, *The Person and the Common Good* (5s.).

BURNS OATES: W. U. Jud, *The Origins of the Great Schism* (18s.); Vera Barclay, *The Way into the Kingdom* (A Book for all who teach) (3s.); M. K. Richardson, *Heaven on Thursday* (The Story of St Madeleine Sophie Barat) (7s. 6d.).

CANTERBURY PRESS: Max Warren, *The Truth of Vision* (9s. 6d.); E. C. Dewick, *The Gospel and Other Faiths* (6s.); Stephen Neill, *The Cross over Asia* (8s. 6d.).

CHRISTIAN ACTION FELLOWSHIP (30, Beaconsfield Road, Birmingham, 12): E. A. Collins, *The Christian and Politics* (6d.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: A. W. Habershon, *The Catechism of the Church of England, Part I* (4s.); G. R. Balleine, *A Layman's History of the Church of England* (6s.).

DACRE PRESS: Austin Farrer, *The Glass of Vision* (12s. 6d.).

DESSAIN (MALINES): A. Croegaert, *Les Rites et les Prières du Saint Sacrifice de la Messe* (vol. i) (150 fr.).

DOBSON: Klaus Mann, *André Gide and the Crisis of Modern Thought* (15s.).

ÉDITIONS DU CERF (PARIS): *Russie et Chrétienté* Cahier No. 1 (110 fr.), Cahier No. 2 (120 fr.).

ÉDITIONS DU SEUIL (PARIS): Jean Daniélou, *Le mystère de l'Avent* (n.p.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Frank Baker, *A Charge to Keep: An Introduction to the People called Methodists* (8s. 6d.).

HARVILL PRESS: Gabriel Marcel, *The Philosophy of Existence* (5s.); Theodor Haecker, *Kierkegaard the Cripple* (5s.).

CHRISTOPHER JOHNSON: B. L. Suzuki, *Mahayana Buddhism* (7s. 6d.).

KAISER VERLAG (MUNICH): Wolfgang Trillhaas, *Evangelische Predigtlehre*; Oscar Hammelsbeck, *Der kirkliche Unterricht* (n.p.).

LATIMER HOUSE: V. H. H. Green, *From Saint Augustine to William Temple* (8s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: H. G. Moss, *The Lord's Prayer in the Bible* (6s. 6d.).

NISBET: F. R. Barry, *The Recovery of Man* (8s. 6d.).

PRESSES UNIVERSITAIRES DE FRANCE: O. Cullmann, *Les Premières Confessions de Foi Chrétiennes* (2nd ed.) (100 fr.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: D. E. Taylor, *In His Presence* (2s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: S. L. Greenslade, *The Church and the Social Order* (6s.); *Man's Disorder and God's Design* (4 vols.) (42s.); Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (9s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher

"Theology" occasional papers

New Series

No. 2. **The Doctrine of Justification in the Anglican Reformers**
By A. H. REES, M.A. 1s.

No. 3. **Jesus Christ in Faith and History**
An Inaugural Lecture in the University of Durham, October 25, 1940.
By A. M. RAMSEY, M.A. 6d.

No. 4. **A "New Deal" for the Church of England**
The Substance of a Sermon before the University of Oxford in St Mary's, on Sexagesima Sunday, February 16, 1941.
By the Rt Rev. LESLIE S. HUNTER, Bishop of Sheffield. 3d.

No. 5. **The Significance of the Barmen Declaration for the OEcumenical Church** 2s.

No. 6. **Life after the Spirit**
By M. CHANING-PEARCE. 1s.

No. 7. **Celibacy and Marriage**
A Study in Clerical Vocation.
By HENRY R. T. BRANDRETH and SHERWIN BAILEY 2s.

No. 8. **Reform of the Ecclesiastical Law**
By G. B. BENTLEY. 1s.

No. 9. **The Anglican Interpretation of the Fourth Commandment**
Here is an important contribution to the study of perhaps the most difficult of the Ten Commandments to explain to the modern world.
By R. P. McDERMOTT. 6d.

No. 10. **Marriage, Divorce and the Church**
Chaos or Reform—Which?
By A. T. MACMILLAN. 1s.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2

HEFFER

THE WOOD

An Outline of Christianity. By a Religious of C.S.M.V. With a Foreword by Bishop Neville Talbot. Second Edition (Reprinted) *7s. 6d. net*

A SIMPLE FORM OF COMPLINE

With additional prayers. Third Edition *4s. net*

BABYLON BRUIS'D AND MOUNT MORIAH MENDED

A visitation of the William Dowsing Society to the Churches and College Chapels of Cambridge. By F. Brittain and Bernard Manning *1s. net*

BERNARD LORD MANNING

A Memoir. Second Edition. 9 full-page illustrations. By F. Brittain *7s. 6d. net*

ST. PAUL FROM THE TRENCHES

A rendering of the Epistles to the Corinthians and Ephesians done in France during the Great War. By Gerald Warre Cornish. With a Foreword by J. S. Braithwaite *2s. net*

BUILDING NEW ORDERS

Christian Essays in Social Reconstruction. By T. G. Tuckey. With a Foreword by A. R. Vidler *4s. 6d. net*

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD. · PUBLISHERS

CAMBRIDGE

Thomas Tenison: Archbishop of Canterbury

His Life and Times

By EDWARD CARPENTER 30s.

Rector of St Martin-in-the-Fields—attended Monmouth before his execution—supported the seven bishops—established a school and the first public library in London—one of the founders of S.P.G.—preached Nell Gwynne's funeral sermon—showed moderation towards dissenters—Archbishop of Canterbury throughout Queen Anne's reign, yet always out of favour politically—played a leading part in the accession of George I. In providing at last a full-scale study of Thomas Tenison, Dr. Carpenter fills a much-needed gap in Church biography.

S·P·C·K

Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2